

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LV, 3

WHOLE No. 219

THE *HERACLIDAE* OF EURIPIDES.

The theme of the *Heracleidae* is how the children of Heracles under the care of Iolaus and Alcmena were driven from city to city throughout Greece, fleeing the wrath of Eurystheus, king of Argos, who hated them for their father's sake. At last they found asylum at Athens, whose king, Demophon, refused to hand them over to the herald of Argos. Then Eurystheus, invading Attica with a great army, met defeat and his own death. In the play we are also told that a daughter of Heracles voluntarily offered herself as a sacrifice to secure the victory of the Athenians and the deliverance of her brothers. It is the treatment of this episode which has caused considerable difficulty to those who would appreciate the play. After the devoted girl has left the stage to meet her fate, nothing more is heard of her at all. Alcmena, who enters immediately after her granddaughter's departure, makes no mention of her. If she is aware that one of her charges has slipped out of the temple, she expresses no curiosity concerning her. Nowhere in the drama are we even told that the sacrifice was carried out.

This uncanny silence (taken in conjunction with certain other factors which will be discussed below) has provoked the suggestion that there is a large lacuna in our texts which originally contained the scene or scenes in which the sacrifice received that elaboration of treatment which Euripides knew so well how to bestow on such a lofty theme. First proposed by Hermann,¹ who placed the lacuna at the very end of the drama, this view

¹ Matthiae, *Euripidis Tragoediae et Fragmenta* (Lipsiae, 1824), VIII, p. 257.

was accepted substantially by Kirchhoff² and Nauck³ with the difference that the supposititious lacuna was transferred to a position immediately after the scene in which the heroic maiden departs and the Chorus briefly hymn her virtues. This modification of Hermann's view was subsequently adopted and further elaborated by Wilamowitz,⁴ whose trenchant exposition of it has commanded the assent of most later criticism.⁵ According to Wilamowitz the play found its present form at the hands of some fourth century producer more preoccupied with the exigencies of his own production than with the preservation of the text of Euripides. Let us notice at once that this theory does not get over the difficulty that towards the end of the play when Alcmena is justifying her plan to murder Eurystheus she makes no mention of her grand-daughter's death, though she might have made a very plausible pretext out of it. Moreover, even if we assume that the heroism of the maiden was adequately celebrated in some lost scene, it still remains rather incredible that it would not have received at least passing mention later on. Also, the Messenger who enters at v. 630 finds Iolaus in the same position he was in at v. 607. Thus, if we are to assume a lengthy lacuna after v. 629, we must also assume that the verses immediately following that verse have been reshaped to hide the gap. This further assumption is organic to the theory

² *Euripidis Tragoediae*, II, adnot. ad *Heraclid.*, 627.

³ *Euripidis Opera* (Teubner), praefat., p. 59.

⁴ *Excursus zu Euripides Herakliden*, *Hermes* XVII (1882), pp. 336-364. Hereafter, to save space, all references to Wilamowitz are to this excursus, except where it is otherwise stated.

⁵ Not all, however. For example, Pflugk, in his edition of the play, Welcker (*Griech. Tragoedien*), Firnhaber (*de tempore quo Heraclidas et composuisse et docuisse Eurip. videatur*), and Hartung (*Euripides Restitutus*) have maintained that in the present play we have substantially what Euripides wrote. So also Wecklein (*Jahresber. über die Fortschr. der class. Altert.*, 1882, and *Blätter für das bayer. Gymnasialschulw.*, 1886, both in criticism of Wilamowitz), and among modern editors Ammendola and Méridier. See also the recent dissertation (*Untersuchungen zu Euripides*, Würzburg, 1931) of R. Sauer, whose hypothesis is that we have here merely a hasty sketch, perhaps never actually produced, that the poet laid it down on certain lines, then remodelled it to incorporate the Macaria scene, but did not take the trouble to complete the remodelling. [This dissertation came to the writer's hands too late to receive fuller notice in this paper.]

of Wilamowitz, who finds vv. 630-660 very objectionable. And objectionable they are, to be sure, but only to the theory with which they do not agree; that seems to be their only offense. Let us first see whether the basic assumption is justified.

Here it is highly important to notice some facts, commonly regarded as having strong evidential value in this connection, which are really of dubious significance.

Firstly, the exceptional brevity of the play as it stands is no evidence of a lacuna. Surely the dramatist may make his drama just as long or short as he pleases or as the circumstances require. Also the *Heraclidae* with its 1055 lines is actually longer than the *Cyclops* and the *Rhesus* with 705 and 996 respectively, and it is not much shorter than the *Alcestis* (1163). Since we do not know the circumstances of its production or anything about the other plays with which it may have been presented, we are not at liberty to read any meaning into its brevity or base any conclusions thereon.

Secondly, altogether too much weight may be attached to the existence of certain fragments commonly assigned to our play which do not occur in it as we have it. Even if the assignment were certain, nothing more would be established than that there are in the text of our play some of those injuries which time has inflicted on all Greek tragedies. As a matter of fact a close examination of the fragments will disclose that there is very little certainty about the business. One of them (fr. 219 Dindorf), quoted by Stobaeus (1, 8),

τρῆς εἰσιν ἀρεταί, τὰς χρέων σ' ἀσκεῖν, τέκνον,
θεοῦς τε τιμᾶν τοὺς τε θρέψαντας γονεῖς
νόμους τε κοινούς 'Ελλάδος· καὶ ταῦτα δρῶν
κάλλιστον ἔξεις στέφανον εὐκλείας ἀεί,

is also assigned to the *Antiope*. Another (fr. 848),

ὅστις δὲ τοὺς τεκόντας ἐν βίῳ σέβει,
ὅδ' ἐστὶ καὶ ζῶν καὶ θανὼν θεοῖς φίλος·
ὅστις δὲ τὸ φύσαντε μὴ τιμᾶν θέλῃ,
μὴ μοι γένοιτο μήτε συνθύτης θεοῖς
μήτ' ἐν θαλάσῃ κοινόπλουν στέλλοι σκάφος,

is quoted by Orion (*Flor. Eur.* 7, p. 56, 2) without any indica-

tion of the play from which it comes; it is Stobaeus (79, 2), quoting the first two lines only, who notes that they are from the *Heracidae* of Euripides. Rather he seems to do so, but there is some doubt about the manuscript tradition and it has already been suggested (by Nauck) that perhaps the fragment should be referred to the *Cressae*, especially as the two plays are confused elsewhere (105, 26) in Stobaeus. A third fragment (fr. 849)

τὸ μὲν σφαγῆναι δεινόν, εὐκλειαν δ' ἔχει.
τὸ μὴ θανεῖν δὲ δειλόν, ἡδονὴ δ' ἐνι,

is in even worse case. It occurs both in Plutarch (*Mor.* p. 447 E) and Stobaeus (7, 9), but the former indicates neither dramatist nor drama, while the latter actually seems to assign it to the *Heracles*; the reference to our play rests on a conjecture of Nauck. It will be noted how largely we are dependent on Stobaeus, of whom Pflugk remarks (*Heraclid. praef.*, p. 20): "*Stobaeum in commemorandis scriptorum nominibus librorumque titulis perambiguae fidei esse constat.*" Thus the external evidence is, to say the least, inconclusive, and we are on no firmer ground when we turn to the consideration of internal probability. Of fragment 219 Wilamowitz says: "this fine sentence gives the quintessence of the drama." It is easy to concede that, especially as the virtues recommended therein are of the nature of commonplaces and might fit almost any drama with a homiletic tendency, but it is not so easy to suppose, as he suggests, that the lines are addressed to Demophon. They are much more like the sentiments which we would expect him to preach to others. Moreover they seem to echo the words of Eurystheus at v. 1010 and would more appropriately occur near the end of the play, if we admit them at all. Fragment 848, we are next told, seems to contain the closing words of the Messenger (probably Demophon himself would return) who brings the description of the death of Macaria. On the other hand, there is the objection⁶ that the lines do *not* apply to Macaria, who gives her life not for her parents but for her brothers. Fragment 849 has been regarded as part of a lost discussion of the rightness of the self-sacrifice. It seems more like a variation

⁶ Wecklein: *Blatter f. das bay. Gymn.*, 1886.

of the theme "to be, or not to be" and would seem more at home in the mouth of the maiden herself in that scene where she decides to die (cf. vv. 533-534). In any case, it is difficult to see either the desirability or the necessity of such a post-mortem as the fragment is said to indicate. There remains the remark of the scholiast at v. 214 of the *Equites* to the effect that that verse is parodied from a verse in the *Heracidae* of Euripides, but here again a pretty controversy has arisen concerning the value of this last piece of evidence.⁷

The third appeal which the advocates of a large lacuna in our play like to make is to certain scholia which tell of honours done to the tomb of the slaughtered maiden. In this connection Wilamowitz has shown⁸ rather conclusively that they all derive from one and the same source and that the original commentator, whose explanation of the proverb βάλλ' εἰς μακαρίαν has been repeated by all the others, borrowed his details of the honours heaped on the courageous girl from that scene in the *Hecuba* which describes the sacrifice of Polyxena. Thus this testimony is so far from establishing the original presence of such an episode in our play that it seems to work the other way.⁹

Fourthly, there is the Argument prefixed to the play where we read: ταύτην μὲν οὖν εὐγενῶς ἀποθανοῦσαν ἐτίμησαν. The play as we have it contains no such scene. On the other hand, Arguments are not always models of perfect accuracy, and in any case the reference may only be to such verses as 622-629. Again, we do not know the date of the Argument. If it belongs to the age which also produced the above explanation of the proverb βάλλ' εἰς μακαρίαν, the reference to the tributes paid to Macaria would come in quite naturally, though such tributes were merely

⁷ τάραντε καὶ χόρδεν' ὁμοῦ τὰ πράγματα παρῴδησε . . . ἐξ Ἡρακλειδῶν Εὐριπίδου. See the discussion of this piece of evidence by Pflugk (*Heracidae*, ed. Pflugk-Klotz, *praef.*, pp. 20-21) who suggests that the scholiast is in error and that the line is really parodied from the *Iolaus* of Sophocles.

⁸ *Index Scholarum in Universitat. litteraria Gryphiswaldensi, ann., 1882, De Euripidis Heraclidis Commentatiuncula.*

⁹ *Index Schol., supra cit.*, p. vii: *Euripidem eadem etiam in Heraclidis habuisse nemo facile sibi persuadebit; grammaticus vero a Polyxena ad Macariam transferebat quibus coniecturae quam de proverbii origine commendabat fidem conciliaret.*

indicated, not described, in the actual play. But the credentials of the Argument have been called into question.¹⁰ In it there is no mention of either drama or dramatist. Moreover, in the play the oracles prescribe a sacrifice to Proserpina, not (with the Argument) to Demeter. We might also add (i) that the writer of the Argument states that Iolaus is the nephew of Heracles, a relationship which Euripides either did not know or deliberately ignored, since it is hardly conceivable that he thought of the decrepit Iolaus and the children of Heracles as belonging to the same generation, with Alcmena standing in *loco aviae* to all of them; ¹¹ (ii) that the herald of Argos and the daughter of Heracles, both anonymous in our drama, have already found proper names in the Argument; (iii) that the *τὴν εὐγενεστάτην παρθένων* of the Argument is not an accurate description of what the oracles demanded (408-409). Altogether it seems probable that our Argument is a fragment of a general summary of the traditions relating to the expedition of Eurystheus against Athens, as these traditions were current long after the composition of the *Heraclidae* of Euripides, and that it was tacked on as a sort of précis to a drama with which it only imperfectly corresponded. We shall come back to the Argument in the discussion of our own theory of the lacuna.

If then our reasoning is sound, we are left with but one ground for the hypothesis of a large lacuna. It is the principle on which Wilamowitz himself sought to work: "Ein Kunstwerk soll ein *ἐν* sein, *ἔχον καὶ ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσον καὶ τέλος*; aus der Oekonomie des vorliegenden Stückes muss die Verstümmelung, an welcher heute kein Urteilsfähiger zweifelt, zu erhärten sein." An excellent criterion, to which we shall return, but rather difficult to apply, since the existence of a large lacuna (e. g. the omission of an entire scene) somewhere or other in the play may

¹⁰ Gotthold: *In Euripidis Heraclidas observationum spec.* I (*Progr. Regimonti*, 1827), p. 2. His three main points (the two quoted above, and the fact that the Argument places the action at Athens, not at Marathon) have been assailed by Vonhoff (*De lacunis quae exstant in Euripid. Heraclidis*, Cottbus., 1872) but, in the case of the first two, may be considered to have survived the assault. As for the third, the situation is less certain, but cf. Wilamowitz, *Index Schol.*, *supra cit.*, pp. xiii-xiv.

¹¹ Elmsley: *Heraclid.*, v. 39; Pflugk-Klotz, *praef.*, p. 15.

give us an entirely erroneous conception of the "Oekonomie des Stückes." It would be a grievous error to rest our hypothesis of the lacuna and its whereabouts on a hypothesis of the economy of the play which in its turn rests on our hypothesis of the lacuna and its whereabouts. In the present case the missing scene (if we are persuaded that there is a missing scene) may be either in the middle or at the end of the play. Wilamowitz, proceeding on his principle that both the beginning *and* the end must be held to be unassailable, decides that the lacuna occurs at v. 629. But is the end of the play above suspicion? The reasons he gives are inconclusive at the best, and there are weighty considerations which point in the other direction. We shall touch on this point later. Meanwhile let us examine more closely the Macaria scene, remembering that not even the hypothesis of Wilamowitz explains the entire absence of reference to the scene in the later part of the play, unless we are to assume a remodelling of such dimensions that Euripides may be regarded as the author of our piece only in a rather attenuated sense, a remodelling, moreover, which nothing else but the exigencies of the hypothesis in question would ever lead us to suspect.

The scene is in many respects highly remarkable. In the first place the whole business is very much of an "episode," in the Aristotelian sense of the word. It is not essential to the working out of the plot. This of course is not in itself a proof of spuriousness. In other respects, also, Euripidean usage hardly squares with Aristotelian theory. But, generally speaking, Euripides is not episodic in the sense referred to. (Aristot. *Poet.* IX, 10: τῶν δὲ ἄλλων μύθων καὶ πράξεων αἱ ἐπεισοδιώδεις εἰσὶν χείρισται. λέγω δ' ἐπεισοδιώδη μῦθον ἐν ᾧ τὰ ἐπεισόδια μετ' ἄλληλα οὐτ' εἰκὸς οὐτ' ἀνάγκη εἶναι. τοιαῦται δὲ ποιοῦνται ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν φαύλων ποιητῶν δι' αὐτοὺς, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν διὰ τοὺς ὑποκριτάς.) Usually every scene has a necessary (or probable) connection with the drama. The nearest approach to the purely ornamental scene in Euripides is probably the self-immolation of Evadne in the *Supplices*. And even that scene is not so much ἐπεισοδιώδης as παραπληρωματικός. It is outside the action; it serves merely to fill out and prolong. Another scene which is often regarded as episodic contains the death-resolve of Menoeceus in the *Phoenissae*. The criticism is scarcely deserved, and is met by Weck-

lein (*Phoenissen*, p. 18): the scene is for contrast; the action of Menoeceus is incorporated in the plot to explain how in spite of the stupid fury of Eteocles and the fact that the gods were bound to support the righteous cause of Polynices the city was nevertheless saved from capture. The scene also serves the purpose of throwing light on Creon's character in preparation for the later scene (Howald: *Gr. Trag.* p. 172). Thus we see that the Macaria scene is more unique than is commonly supposed. Moreover, in the various legends, current in Attic, Boeotian, and Peloponnesian mythology, relating to the children of Heracles, there is no mention of their deliverance from death through such an act of sisterly self-sacrifice.¹² The heroic girl would seem to be an invention of the dramatist. Then, as we have seen, she is nameless in the play. Nowhere are we told who this daughter of Heracles is. And it is not merely throughout the play that she remains nameless, but probably for one or two hundred years after it.¹³ Now it is a strain on our credulity to try to believe that Euripides grudged a name to a person to whom he did not grudge a glorious rôle in his play. In the *Supplices* Evadne receives more chivalrous treatment, though she is merely a minor ornament of the drama and cannot be compared with Macaria either in heroism or dramatic importance. This anonymity of the heroine robs the scene of all individual interest.

Again, her entrance is feebly motivated and entirely unexpected. Indeed it would not be unfair to say that it is quite *casual*. She is very apologetic about it all, she does not usually behave like this, but the *στενάγματα* of Iolaus have brought her out to learn what the trouble is. Now, it is true that Iolaus has just addressed a very sorrowful harangue to the little children, but there has been nothing resembling the ringing lamentations which are usually employed by the Greek tragedians when they wish to supply an entrance cue to a character off stage. In that sense there have been no *στενάγματα*. And if Macaria means that she has overheard the last utterances of the old man, why does she need to inquire after the nature of the trouble? There is the further *technical* difficulty that the man-

¹² For a review of these legends, see Méridier: *Les Heraclides* (Collection des Universités de France), pp. 179 ff.

¹³ The point is discussed by Wilamowitz, *Index Schol.*, *supra cit.*, pp. iii ff.

ner of her entrance is quite against the usual Euripidean practice. In all his other plays, once the prologue is over and the dialogue has got under way, no character ever enters for the first time unannounced, except at the end of a lyrical passage.¹⁴ To the modern taste, indeed, there often seems to be excessive artificiality in the care which is taken to let the audience know who is who on the stage. Yet in the scene under discussion, though Demophon, Iolaus, and the Chorus could all prepare us for her entrance, she bursts on the scene without a word from them. Rather strange conduct in the light of the words of Iolaus at vv. 43-44.¹⁵

There is another difficulty, also partly technical, but at the same time passing beyond considerations of mere dramatic technique. Contrast the scene before us with those others in which the poet presents the sacrifice of a young girl, Polyxena in the *Hecuba* and Iphigeneia in the *Iphigeneia in Aulide*. Euripides is particularly adept at varying his metres to suit the moods and emotions of his characters. In exalted moments the calm iambs are dropped; only music is fit to carry such a burden. So Polyxena and Iphigeneia cannot just speak; they must sing. This use of lyrical utterance is seen also in the *Hippolytus* where Phaedra wrestles with her lovestricken soul, in the *Andromache* where death is threatening a mother and her child, in the *Orestes* where Electra waits for Hermione outside the palace within which Helen is to be slain, and in the *Suppliants* where Evadne can no longer live on, with her husband dead. Yet Macaria calmly talks herself to death in iambic trimeters.¹⁶

¹⁴ This does not apply to the entrances of gods and goddesses. Apart from the merely apparent exceptions (e. g. *Electra* 82 and 761), we have the unannounced appearance of the Pythia in the *Ion* (1320) and the entrance of the Messenger at v. 597 of the *Helena*. In the former case her dress and her exit from the shrine would probably be an adequate introduction. Anyhow, all eyes at the time are on the central figures of Creusa and Ion, each preoccupied with the other. In the second instance, it is only a Messenger, who can hardly expect to receive the ceremonious treatment of more important characters. Also, we already know that Menelaus has left his companions in the cave and we are almost expecting what follows.

¹⁵ πᾶς γὰρ παρθένους αἰδούμεθα | ὅχλῳ πελάζειν κάπιβωμιοστατεῖν.

¹⁶ Menoeceus, of course, is very matter-of-fact about his self-slaughter

We are now face to face with the chief objection to the whole scene, its awful weakness and abysmal bathos. We have already touched on the lack of all individual interest in the nameless heroine. Then there is her frigid justification of her claim to be told what the trouble is about, a very necessary justification since we all know that it is not she, but Alcmena who should have been informed of the new disaster, if anybody was to be informed. Again, the very suddenness of her decision to offer herself as a sacrifice has caused the critics some discomfort, aggravated further by the rather uncereemonious assent of Iolaus, who seems to be mainly concerned that he shall in no way be held responsible for the action of Macaria. As Wilamowitz sees, so little is made of it all, the sacrifice seems so easy, that we actually feel nothing heroic in it; she is giving up nothing. And how miserably prosaic and inappropriate in the mouth of a young girl are her last words: if there is any life beyond the grave, she will have the consolation of her *mens sibi conscia recti*, but she quite decidedly hopes that death will prove the end of all consciousness, for things are in a pretty mess indeed if mortal anxieties are to vex us over there. In short, Macaria is a bit of a prig. Even in the face of death she finds time to advise Iolaus on the education of her little brothers. Euripides doubtless makes some of his characters utter very surprising sentiments, but is it not almost incredible that "the most tragic of poets," who even in his earliest plays shows such unequalled skill in the portrayal of the pathetic, could have sunk so low as this? Psychologically untrue, aesthetically unpleasing, economically unnecessary, the scene is wholly miserable.

But, if nowhere in the play are we prepared for this scene, if at no subsequent stage does any of the characters seem to be aware that there was such a scene, if the technique thereof is quite out of line with the usual practice of Euripides, if the whole scene, in conception and execution, seems totally unworthy of our dramatist, and in addition rather interferes with than assists the development of the plot, are we not directed to the

in the *Phoenissae*, but his position is so different. He is a young man, exposed to an atmosphere charged with patriotic fervour, himself presumably too young to fight, who jumps at the opportunity of "doing his bit." The dramatist's portrayal here is psychologically sound; this is no occasion for lyrics.

conclusion that the offending scene was no part of the original play but was added by a later and a weaker hand?

That the poorness of the scene presents a genuine difficulty, the attempts made to explain away its weakness prove.¹⁷ To excuse is to accuse. These attempts vary according to whether Iolaus or Athens is to be regarded as the 'hero' of the play, but the gist of all of them is that any real elaboration of the scene, any attempt to develop the character of Macaria, would divert attention from the central issue. Such advocacy is deadly to the cause of its own client. It concedes the point which completes its damnation, namely, that the scene has no function to perform within the plan of the drama. Why then did the poet introduce the episode at all? If his policy was to add variety to the course of things, to tickle the ears and eyes of the groundlings, why did he not take the trouble to make a better job of it, as we know he so eminently could?

Here we might raise a point that does not seem to have received due notice from the editors and critics. The oracles seem to have spiked the guns of Athenian good intention. Then, we are told,¹⁸ "the entrance of Macaria resolves the deadlock by a bold *coup de théâtre*," for which there is nothing in the tradition. But be it noted that the arrival of Hyllus with his improbable army is equally a bold *coup de théâtre*, for which there is nothing in the tradition. It plays the same part in the development of the story as the Macaria scene is said to play. Admittedly Hyllus has to be in at the death, but there is no reason why he could not have returned in dejection, having found no allies anywhere, thereby increasing the glory of Athens. We ask the question: why two bold *coups de théâtre*, when one would be enough, why fly *twice* in the face of all tradition?

If we reject the Macaria scene, what do we retain, what other alterations are necessitated by our excision? We would retain everything up to v. 474 and everything after v. 629. Then we merely have to assume that Iolaus, thinking his cause is definitely lost with the refusal of Athens to assist him, lies down in despair on the altar steps and covers his face with his cloak.

¹⁷ Cf. Pflugk-Klotz, p. 20. Also Welcker (*l. c.*), Firnhaber (*l. c.*), and Hartung (*l. c.*).

¹⁸ Méridier, *l. c.*, p. 185.

Then the Chorus may have commented on the sudden turn of events (vv. 607-616 would be appropriate here), but that is not necessary. Then the Messenger enters with his good news and Iolaus emerges. It might be noted here that the strophe (607-616) is not very appropriate in its present position at the close of the Macaria scene. She has just rescued the whole situation and made victory certain, whereas the strophe is a song of resignation in defeat. In the *Hercules Furens* Megara expresses exactly the same sentiments (309-311) when her cause seems to be quite hopeless. Thus it is possible that this strophe found a place in the original play after Iolaus resigned himself to the apparently inevitable, but the point is not worth stressing. What ought to be stressed, however, is that vv. 630 ff. *as they stand* do not fit either with the Macaria scene or with such a scene as might be supposed to fill a large lacuna at this part, but can be shown to follow quite naturally if we assume that the Macaria scene is an interpolation, which preserves (vv. 602-604) merely the conclusion of the previous episode.

Let us examine the juncture in detail. On the one side, it is hardly appropriate for Iolaus to lie down in despair when victory has just been signed and sealed for his cause. Furthermore, he now knows that battle is imminent, and one who in the next scene is inspired with such prodigious ardour is hardly likely to sit down now and cover his head. But if he has just learned that there is to be no battle, that his allies have deserted him, that he has no hope left, his action becomes quite intelligible. On the other side of the juncture a closer study will not be unfruitful. According to our hypothesis Iolaus is roused from his weakness and despair by the glad tidings that Hyllus has unexpectedly found assistance somewhere and is at hand with a large army. "Friend," he asks the Messenger, "are you come to save us from destruction ($\beta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\beta\eta\varsigma$, 640)?" The question is significant. Firstly, if Macaria had died for them, they were already saved from destruction. Secondly, if the prostration of Iolaus had been from grief for Macaria, the news of reinforcements would avail nothing to slake that grief. Yet we find the old man breaking into transports of joy and summoning Alcmena out of the temple to hear the good news. We are told that she has been wasting away with sorrow. But for whom? For the absent Hyllus and his brothers, not for Macaria. An-

other significant fact is that Alcmena, hearing his shout, assumes that it is another (αῖ) Argive herald. Probably because such a herald was the occasion of the last outcry she had heard (73). In that case what had *Macaria* heard to bring her out of the temple? If we assume, however, that the preceding scene had heard the death-knell of their hopes, who would be more likely to appear now than an Argive herald to hale the prisoners off to their doom? Thus Alcmena's error (which otherwise seems pretty pointless) becomes perfectly natural and rather striking. To return to Iolaus. He now realises that his affairs have taken on a wholly different complexion. Different circumstances call forth different omens. While the Athenians were so badly outnumbered¹⁹ by the enemy, horrible things like human sacrifices may have been necessary, but now with the arrival of Hyllus and his army the prospects of a successful resistance to Argos are distinctly brighter. Hence the next remark of Iolaus: "I suppose the Athenian leaders have been informed of this (670)." The messenger not merely assures him of this, but also adds that Hyllus and his men have taken their place on the left wing. The old man is thunderstruck. Events are happening too quickly for him. Not so long ago his world had collapsed about his ears, and now, now (ἤδη) he finds himself on the eve of a successful battle. The soothsayers (if they had been consulted again) had excogitated happier omens, like good and careful Athenians.

Thus we see that vv. 630 ff. do not justify the assumption that they have been revised to fit the *Macaria* scene after an intervening scene had been omitted. They do *not* fit the *Macaria* scene. They do fit the scene preceding the *Macaria* scene.

Is there any evidence external to the play which would prove that it *originally* contained the scene we wish to expunge? All the references are very late, and consequently, even if they actually referred by name and title to the *Heracleidae* of Euripides

¹⁹ That they are outnumbered is shown (a) by v. 689, where Iolaus justifies his decision to fight on the ground that even with the assistance of Iolaus and his men they are about to fight (μαχούμεθ' Dobree) enemies who are no fewer, *i. e. per litotem*, much more numerous than they: such an interpretation as Pflugk accepts from Elmsley seems fantastic in the light of the Servant's comment at v. 690; (b) by the description of the battle, especially vv. 834-842.

pides, that would not preclude the possibility that the reference is to the play *as interpolated*.²⁰ As a matter of fact, there seems to be only one explicit reference. A scholiast at v. 1157 of the *Knights* mentions the story of Macaria, though not quite as we have it in our play, and adds *ὡς ἐν Ἡρακλείδαις Εὐριπίδου*. Of which Wilamowitz:²¹ "*hic non solum licenter omnia permixta sunt, sed fabulae . . . ita immutatae ut ab Euripide plane abhorreat testis excitatur ipse Euripides, . . . Itaque tantum abest ut hoc scholion inter testimonia tragoediae Euripideae referendum sit, ut nequissima nequam interpolationis interpolatio prorsus de medio tollenda sit.*" Plutarch mentions Macaria²² the daughter of Heracles as one who had died for her brothers, and since we do know²³ that he was acquainted with our play it is possible that Macaria appeared in his copy. But Plutarch wrote about five hundred years after Euripides was in his grave. We have mentioned the scholia dealing with the origin of the proverb *βάλλ' εἰς μακαρίαν*. We might also mention a scholion at v. 365 of the *Plutus*, where we are told of a painting by one Apollodorus in which "Iolaus, Alcmena, and a daughter of Heracles" are represented supplicating the Athenians. But who this Apollodorus was nobody can state for sure, and in any case if the description of the painting is accurate the latter was clearly *not* the reproduction of any scene in our drama. Neither can the Argument prefixed to our tragedy be admitted as evidence in this connection. Obviously it must be posterior to the version of which it is the précis, however and whenever that version came into being. On the other side there is the fact, mentioned above, that the sacrifice of Macaria does not seem to have had any place in the original legends. Also, since the assistance extended by Athens to the children of Heracles was almost a commonplace of the Greek orators,²⁴ who nevertheless never refer to the self-sacrifice of the daughter, we may see therein an

²⁰ Cf. Aeschyl., *Septem c. Thebas*, where we have scholia on verses which are almost certainly interpolations, e. g., vv. 534-6 (ed. Verrall), vv. 1005 *et seq.* (ed. Mazon).

²¹ *Index Schol.*, *supra cit.*, p. vi.

²² *Pelopid. Vit.*, 21.

²³ *Stoicos absurdiora poetis dicere*, 2.

²⁴ Lysias, *Epitaph.*, 11; Demosth., *Epitaph.*, 8, *De Corona*, 186; Isocrat., *Panegy.*, 56, *Panathen.*, 194; Aristid., I, p. 175 (Dindorf).

argument *ex silentio* in favour of the view that even in that age the sacrifice had not yet been invented. In fine, there does not seem to be any conclusive evidence that Euripides introduced the episode of Macaria in his *Heracidae*. When and by whom the figure of Macaria was created, the lack of evidence does not permit us even to guess. The theme was doubtless handled by many dramatists both before and after Euripides. We know that Aeschylus composed a tragedy with the same title and Sophocles wrote an *Iolaus*, apparently on the lines of our tragedy. Beyond these bare facts nothing is certain. Our contention is merely that the episode of Macaria has no place in our tragedy, but was inserted later, perhaps sometime before the work of the Alexandrian critics. We do not require here to establish a reason for the interpolation, though we may suggest at least two possible causes. Firstly, such scenes of self-sacrifice must have been very popular with Athenian audiences; Euripides evidently thought so, if his fondness for the topic is any guide. Secondly, Demophon's consultation with the soothsayers and their replies afforded an obvious peg on which to hang such a scene.

Here another question raises an importunate head. Why should Euripides have introduced the incident of the oracles if he did not intend to satisfy their inhuman demands? The parallel play, the *Supplices*, suggests an answer: to introduce suspense and dramatic tension. Once the Athenians had pledged their support to a cause, that cause could not fail to triumph in an Athenian theatre. So in the *Supplices* the suspense is introduced by the refusal of Theseus to take up the cause of Adrastus. Everything seems to be lost, until he is won over by Aethra.²⁵ In the *Heracidae* any such device was impossible. Demophon is bound by ties of piety, kinship, and honour to lend all his assistance (237-247). But he was a constitutional ruler, and if the people did not wish to succour the suppliants he had to abide by their decision. With this stone Euripides killed three birds: he secured the necessary element of suspense, he paid tribute to the *ἐλευθερία* of Athens, and he landed a shrewd blow on the whole tribe of oraclemongers who issue such inhuman advices. Notice too that to have proceeded with the sacrifice would have weakened the effect of the whole drama. Then

²⁵ Eur., *Supplic.*, vv. 286 ff.

the children of Heracles would have been rescued almost entirely by their own efforts: the self-sacrifice of Macaria, the associates of Hyllus, the uncanny feats of arms of Iolaus, and the fury of Alcmena. The 'Spartans' would have been their own deliverers. But in that case where would have been the name and fame of Athens?

This consideration seems to clinch the case against the authenticity of the Macaria scene. It is out of line with the general direction of the drama. It is worse than unnecessary; it is a positive nuisance. It obscures the issue and blunts the point of the play. What is that point? In other words, who is the 'hero' of the drama? It is not Iolaus. That scene in which he leaves for the battlefield is enough to damn the most heroic hero who ever strutted the boards of tragedy. Servant and Chorus both assure him that he can be of no assistance to his friends and will only hurt himself. Alcmena bluntly tells him he is out of his mind. Actually his armour (which he borrows from the temple walls) is too heavy for him to wear; the servant has to carry it for him, and also support the tottering warrior and direct his steps. Later, in the description of the battle, Euripides very pointedly indicates that, whereas the Messenger actually witnessed the rest of the battle, his tale of the miraculous rejuvenation of Iolaus is the merest hearsay. We are told, to be sure, that Iolaus asked Hyllus to let him come up on to his chariot. Remembering the condition of the doughty grey-beard when we saw him leave the stage, trailing clouds of glory and his superannuated limbs, we can easily imagine a very human motive behind his request for a lift. It may be objected that the heroes of Euripides are often very unheroic and a very imperfect character may still play the leading rôle in, and personally constitute the dramatic unity of, a Euripidean tragedy. Orestes would be a case in point. In the present play, however, the real reason why Iolaus cannot be regarded as the central character is not simply that he is decrepit, but that he is ludicrous. And he is made ludicrous almost at the expense of dramatic consistency. Until the stage is set for the decisive encounter, Iolaus though never a strong character has been dignified, courageous, in many respects commanding our unqualified admiration. Why does the dramatist suddenly betray him to the scoffers? Probably because Euripides wished Athens to

have all the kudos of the victory. Tradition allowed Iolaus at least to share the laurels. So much Euripides had to concede, but he concedes it *more suo*: yes, Iolaus may have been at the battle, but (all the fictions of heated imaginations notwithstanding) what sort of part must he have played therein, who could not walk in his armour, much less fight? Neither must we look to the character of Alcmena to supply light and leading to the play. Apart from one brief appearance, she does not begin to affect the action till v. 941. Here a word of warning seems necessary. Altogether too much has been made of certain resemblances between her rôle and that of Hecuba in the play of that name.²⁶ The differences are no less important. The *Hecuba* is a study of abnormal psychology. The whole play centres round the tragic figure of "the mobled Queen." Everything that happens derives its significance from its effect on the central figure. She holds the stage throughout the tragedy. More important still, she holds our sympathies throughout; even in her fiendish revenge on Polymestor God knows and we all know that she has had ample provocation. Her action is wrong, but it is intelligible in the sense that we are expecting it. Alcmena on the other hand has a very small part to play in the *Heraclidae*, and it is an unsympathetic part. At the end our sympathies are all with Eurystheus. The motive of Alcmena seems to be almost spite; revenge is too good a name for it. If she murders her prisoner because she holds him responsible for the death of Macaria, why does she not cast that in his teeth? Hecuba, to be sure, does not mention the murder of her son to his murderer, but that is because her plan requires her to dissimulate; the spectators already know what has driven the queen to such an act. But Alcmena, against the advice of everybody, commits murder in cold blood and seeks to justify her action by a piece of unredeemed casuistry. The truth is that Athens is the hero of the piece.²⁷ It is another *ἐγκώμιον Ἀθηνῶν*, and for parallel we must look to the *Supplices* of the same author. In some respects indeed the patriotism is laid on with a thicker brush than in any other play of Euripides. Athens alone is the

²⁶ Cf. Wilamowitz. Also Howald: *Die Griechische Tragödie*, pp. 148-149. The presence of the Macaria scene is chiefly responsible for this conception of our play.

²⁷ Steiger: *Euripides, seine Dichtung und seine Persönlichkeit*, p. 95.

champion of the oppressed. She is, *par excellence*, the Free City. The note is struck for the first time at v. 62. "Free is the land in which we stand." It is re-echoed throughout the course of the play (198, 244, 287, 423, 957, etc.). Iolaus, Demophon, even Alcmena, all sound it in turn. Ἐλευθερία. It is promised, as the greatest conceivable reward, to the messenger who brings the news of victory, and at the end of his narrative he does not fail to remind Alcmena of the prize she has promised him. Athens, conscious of her mission and high calling, is certain too of her glorious future. She is the Land of Hope and Glory. Athenians never shall be slaves²⁸ (352). She loves Peace as much as any other people, but if she has to fight, woe to her enemies. One is reminded of a modern version of the same strain: "We don't want to fight, but if we do, we've got the guns, we've got the men, we've got the money too."

This point is of paramount importance, because not until we know the *Leitmotif* of the drama can we argue with any assurance for (and from) its general economy and design.

Now to summarise the plot of the piece in the light of our hypothesis. Iolaus with the younger sons of Heracles has sought sanctuary on the steps of the altar. Alcmena and her granddaughters are within the temple, while Hyllus and the older sons are away somewhere making a last desperate attempt to find allies or another refuge, should Athens fail them. A herald of Argos, called Copreus in the list of *Dramatis personae*, arrives and is about to hale off his helpless prisoners despite the protests of the Chorus of old men of Marathon, when Demophon enters with his entourage and after hearing both sides of the question decides to succour the suppliants and dismisses the truculent herald, despising his threats. Iolaus reminds the children of the eternal obligation under which they now stand towards Athens. The Chorus sing a patriotic ode. The stage is set for a successful battle and the triumph of justice and mercy. Suddenly Demophon returns with a cloud on his brow and the sad tale of the oracles on his lips. The fight is off. The oracles demand the sacrifice of a highborn maiden. Demophon

²⁸ νικωμένη γὰρ Πάλλας οὐκ ἀνέξεται. Wilamowitz objects to this passage on the score of μεγαληγορία (as well as on other grounds), but the language of wartime patriotism tends to bombast.

will not give up any daughter of his or order any of the citizens to do so. And surely, he adds, nobody would be so wrongheaded as to consent willingly to such a sacrifice. Iolaus must find some other way . . . and there is no way. So, as Demophon departs, the old man virtually collapses on the altar steps, shrouds his head in his cloak, and resigns himself to his fate. Suddenly his luck turns. The servant of Hyllus arrives with the almost incredible tidings of rescue and Alcmena is summoned forth from the temple. We have already analysed the ensuing scene and have sought to show its intimate organic connection with what has gone before. Let us now try to answer a further question which has been raised by the critics. Why is Alcmena brought on here? We have seen that her conversation with Iolaus here is not the meaningless stupid thing that it has generally been held to be. There is still more to be said. Euripides is about to embark on rationalistic criticism of the miraculous rejuvenation of Iolaus. His method is the method of the *Alcestis*, a *reductio ad absurdum*. The scene in which Iolaus departs for the field of glory is almost farce, and here Alcmena has a part to play. Firstly, she is used to accentuate the decrepitude of Iolaus. She imagines that he has appealed to *her*, a grandmother, for assistance against the emissary of Eurystheus. In the second place only she may speak frankly to the bellicose old gentleman. The Chorus are strangers. The Messenger is a servant. Only she can tell him that he is clean out of his wits. Off he is conveyed to battle, and after another choral ode a Messenger enters with word of victory and sorrows past. In the next scene the Servant of Hyllus returns and delivers the captive Eurystheus into the hands of Alcmena, and after considerable crimination and recrimination, during which our sympathies naturally switch to Eurystheus, she announces her murderous plan against the helpless prisoner. Even the Servant advises her against it. The Chorus too urges her to respect the wishes of Athens and spare him. She heeds them not and has him led within to be slaughtered. The Chorus seems to connive at the crime, and so the play stops.

What are we to make of such a conclusion? Its abruptness has already caused the critics considerable discomfort. Schlegel remarks:²⁹ "The *Heraclidae* is a very paltry play; the end is

²⁹ *Über dramat. Kunst*, I, p. 260.

particularly weak." It has been proposed ³⁰ to regard the last utterance as the opinion of half the Chorus, which in the original play would have been answered by the other half, and so the question of the justice of the murder would have been left open. Also it was originally thought that the scenes which are now alleged to have departed this world at v. 629 really had their being at the very end of the drama. Our task is not to go into the merits of these views, but rather to examine the contrary opinion which defends the integrity of the conclusion as it stands.

In the first place, it has been argued ³¹ that the prophesyings of the doomed Eurystheus are most appropriately placed at the very end of the piece. This argument looks to those other plays of the poet which end with a vista of the future. More particularly it rests on the analogy of the *Hecuba*, which closes with the prophetic utterance of Polymestor; and of the *Supplices*, where Adrastus is told what the duty of Argos will be if Athens is ever invaded. But analogies are kittle cattle. The close of the *Supplices* shows a certain resemblance to the scene in our play where Iolaus bids the children hold the friendship of Athens in perpetual remembrance, but nobody would suggest that our play could have stopped there. Why not? Simply because the action had not run its course. The scene *might* have been very appropriate as a concluding scene, but as a matter of fact it is not the concluding scene. So the *Bacchae* might have ended with the death of Pentheus, and the women left howling in the wilderness, but it does not. Or we might argue that *Julius Caesar* might have ended with the death of Caesar because *Macbeth* ended with the death of Macbeth. And, to be sure, it might have so ended, had Shakespeare so planned it. In playwriting the whole is greater than the parts, and our opinions of the relationship of the parts to each other or to the whole must rest on our conception of the whole. For example, we have suggested above that the *Heraclidae* and the *Hecuba*, despite superficial resemblances, are very dissimilar in dramatic conception. This is not to say that no comparisons may be drawn between them, but it must always be remembered that similar scenes

³⁰ Murray, *Euripidis fabulae* (ed. Oxon.), III, adnot. crit. ad *Heraclid.*, 1055.

³¹ By Wilamowitz.

within the two plays may play very dissimilar parts in the whole and may quite appropriately occur at different stages of the development of the plot. The ultimate destination determines the intermediate steps. We have returned to the criterion, admitted above to be the only valid criterion, "the economy of the piece." How does the opinion which we are now contesting stand up to this criterion?

The integrity of the conclusion is rested on the ground that the drama has run its course. We are told³¹ that no person has anything more to do on the stage; Iolaus might re-enter, but after all he would have to appear as a young man and that would be rather intolerable. It will be seen at once that such an argument is based on a conception of the drama which we have found impossible to accept, namely, the view that the play centres round the character of Iolaus. The argument falls to the ground if we hold fast to the doctrine that we have before us an encomium of Athens. In that case, so far is the plot from its natural and logical culmination and conclusion that it seems to have stopped almost in the middle course. It is all loose ends. We have seen that Alcmena is a rather subordinate character in the drama. Nobody is really interested in her or her views. Yet now we are asked to believe that Euripides suddenly rescues her from her retirement and allows her to dominate the final scene. And with whom? With Eurystheus,³² another character in whom we have no real personal interest and who now appears for the first time. The brave opening of the play seems far, far away. There we had been introduced to one set of characters, but they have all disappeared never to return. Where now is Iolaus, where is Demophon, where is Athens? The whole moral issue of the battle has been forgotten. Euripides has changed his mind about his theme, or has grown tired of it, and has begun to write the preliminary draft of another *Hecuba*. It is passing strange. We are forced to the assumption that the end of the play is lost, that we are faced with a very considerable lacuna.

Let us look again at the end of the play as we have it, and our

³² There is no inconsistency in the treatment of Eurystheus in the play. Naturally Iolaus and company are very bitter against him, but as early as vv. 465-470, Demophon seems to reprimand the violence of their language. On the other hand cf. Steiger, *l. c.*, p. 96.

awakened suspicions will find some corroboration in the fact that the drama seems to stop with a sentiment of which Euripides could not approve. This is unlike his other practice. So far the *Heracidae* has shown much the same pattern as its parallel the *Supplices*. Suddenly it ends with an act which is contrary to the ideals of Athens as Pericles and Euripides conceived them, an act of barbarity for which there has been no adequate cause, an act, moreover, carried out in flat disobedience to the express command of the Athenians. Euripides could not leave such an act uncondemned. Even in the *Hecuba* there is a sort of court of judgment on the blinding of Polymestor and the murder of his children. There is much more need of one here. The king of Argos had been guilty of no such crimes as had made the Thracian prince an object of general abomination. It had already been decided by the authorities that he was not to die; Athens does not murder her prisoners taken in war. (Nor does she so sophisticate truth as to argue that after all she is not concerned with the murder, since it was Alcmena who committed it. Such casuistry was a Spartan trick. We have seen Alcmena playing the old game and seeming to impose on the Chorus with it, but we wait the arrival of someone more representative of Athens to set the action in its true light.) Furthermore, Demophon clearly did not regard the enemy king as a monster of iniquity. Indeed he had already conceded at least the practical expediency of his persecution of the children of Heracles.³³ Self-preservation made such a course quite natural. *Salus populi suprema lex*. Yet Alcmena proposes to destroy her helpless victim in cold blood. The very servant promises her that she will incur much blame. And suddenly the play is over. It is a violation of the expectancies of the drama. Was it for this that Euripides, in the teeth of all tradition, rescued Eurystheus from the field of battle and delivered him into the hands of the mother of Heracles? Was it not rather to supply a contrasting background before which the clemency and humanity of Athens would stand in all its beauty? Here if anywhere in the play is the elusive lacuna and it is a large one.

We can only guess what filled the hole, but there are considerations to guide our guesswork. In particular, it seems

³³ See n. 32 *supra*.

legitimate to assume (a) that Alcmena does carry out her fell intention and Eurystheus is murdered (b) that the play ends with a speech by Demophon or an appearance of Athena, or both. In the first place, the various legends about the expedition of Eurystheus do not all concur on all points. For example, there was some uncertainty about the site of the battle, and Eurystheus met different deaths at the hands of different people,³⁴ but on one point there is complete agreement, namely, that he did die. If this is to be conceded, it is not difficult to imagine the general plan of its presentation in our play. The king would be led within to meet his fate, there would almost certainly be a choral ode, towards the end of which the cries of the victim would be heard, and then the ἐκκύκλημα would reveal the body and Alcmena exulting over it.

In the second place, the action has to be condemned if the tenour of the play is to be preserved. Spartan cruelty must be admonished by Athenian enlightenment. Athens must dominate the stage at the end, Athens the Free, the Hellas of Hellas. The ruling motives of the whole action have been Athenian ἐλευθερία, αἰδώς, εὐσέβεια, in short, ἀρετή. These must be restressed, underlined. Only Demophon, or Athena, can do that. We are thus not transgressing the limits of probability if we assume that Demophon, probably accompanied by Hyllus and Iolaus,³⁵ returns from the field of glory and passes the ultimate judgment on the scheme of things, 'points the moral and adorns the tale.' In that case there may have been a sort of ἀμύλλα λόγων between him and Alcmena in which her action would be roundly condemned, and the play may have been rounded off by Athena from the machine.

The main thing is that the "economy of the piece" points to a large lacuna at the end. The drama has καὶ ἀρχὴν καὶ μέσον, but, as it stands, it has no τέλος. But we can see to what end the *Leitmotif* is leading. We can affirm with considerable probability the ideas that must be dominant at the end. The practice of Euripides helps us to imagine how these ideas may have

³⁴ Méridier, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

³⁵ Since Euripides clearly did not believe (or wish anybody else to believe) that Iolaus was really rejuvenated, there is no reason to suppose that he would hesitate to bring him back onto the stage as an old man, thus putting the whole question up to the faithful.

found expression. The details are not so very important, but to realise that we have lost the last scene of the play, to realise what the function of that scene must have been, that is the important thing. Only thus are we able properly to appreciate that part of the play which fortune has spared to us.

Wilamowitz has called the *Heraklidae* "the most insignificant play" of Euripides that we have. We can only say that any play, which is not only marred by an unlovely excrescence in the middle but has also lost the conclusion which the whole action subserved, is rather apt to seem insignificant, unless that sad fact is kept in mind. But if we hold steadfastly to the belief that we have before us not the play but the mutilated torso of the play, certain passages that are otherwise regarded as frigid and tasteless, if not actually expunged as spurious, may enter into their heritage. The course of our discussion has already touched on several such instances. Here we may content ourselves with only one or two more.

One such passage is at vv. 1050-1051, where Alcmena exclaims

κομίζετ' αὐτόν, δμῶες, εἴτα χρὴ κυσὶ
δοῦναι κτανόντας.

She is going to surrender the corpse of Eurystheus to the fury of the dogs. But her plan, outlined at vv. 1020-1025, required that Eurystheus be afforded burial. Both Musgrave and Elmsley in their editions animadverted on this apparent contradiction, and more recently³⁶ we have heard suggestions that *κυσὶ* must be an error, that the true reading should be something like *χθονὶ* or *πυρὶ*. But if Euripides is paving the way for a final scene in which such animal ferocity is to be outlawed, the exaggeration of that ferocity is eminently in order. There is no need to tamper with the text. Only if this is the end of the play, only if this is the last word of Euripides on the drama, does the need arise.

Verses 630 ff. are another much maligned passage. The presence of Alcmena in this scene has proved very distasteful to many critics. In the course of our argument we have already tried to show that Euripides has employed her as the instrument of certain effects which it would have been difficult by any other

³⁶ Méridier, *op. cit.*, p. 235, n.

means to produce. Something more calls to be added. Those who ask why she is brought out at this juncture should notice that Euripides himself, by the mouth of Iolaus, has anticipated and answered their question. Alcmena has been worrying herself to death over the absent Hyllus and his brothers, fearing they would never return. What is more natural, therefore, than that Iolaus should desire to put an end to her anxiety? And he tells us (vv. 644-645) that that is why he summoned her. Moreover it is to be remembered that Iolaus is very soon to quit the stage, thus creating a problem of stagecraft for Euripides. Are the children to be left alone on the steps of the altar. Also, who is to receive the news of victory when the Messenger arrives? It has to be Alcmena. Her presence on the stage forms the link between the first part of the action and the second. Now that is just the function of subsidiary characters in drama: to add variety and verisimilitude, to facilitate transitions, to be the occasion (not the cause) of action. Such a subsidiary is Alcmena, and as such Euripides employs her with considerable skill and ingenuity. But if we regard her as a tragic figure of primary importance, as one for whom and in whom the action fulfils itself, then we must condemn Euripides for a botcher and a bungler.

To add a third example, we must turn to those much discussed verses 818-822:

Ἵλλος μὲν οὖν ἀπώχετ' ἐς τάξιν πάλιν·
 μάντεϊς δ' ἐπειδὴ μονομάχου δι' ἀσπίδος
 διαλλαγὰς ἔγνωσαν οὐ τελουμένας,
 ἔσφαζον, οὐκ ἔμελλον, ἀλλ' ἀφίεσαν
 λαιμῶν βροτείων εὐθὺς οὐρίον φόνον.

As the text stands, we have a reference to a human sacrifice, presumably that of Macaria. According to our view of the Macaria scene, we may here accept the text by assuming that these lines were inserted by the same hand that composed the scene of the sacrifice, and that view might explain the shocking inelegance of the reference. All that heroism rewarded by four obscure verses! And notice the plural λαιμῶν; she is slaughtered like one of a herd of sheep or goats. Unable to stomach such ingratitude, Paley³⁷ has proposed to read βροτείων, 'of sheep,'

³⁷ *Heraclid.*, note to v. 822. No great weight attaches to the fact

instead of *βορείων*. Wilamowitz, on the other hand, frowning on such interference with the text, would retain *βορείων* and regard vv. 819-822 as interpolated by the hand that removed those central scenes which his hypothesis demands. He objects to such a conjecture as *βορείων* (he is dealing with Vonhoff's suggestion *βοείων*) on the ground that the mention of the sacrifice only has sense if the sacrifice is an extraordinary one. If it is merely the customary propitiation, preliminary to all battles, why mention it at all? He is tempted also to extend this objection to v. 673, where Iolaus, asking if the clash is really so imminent, is told:

*καὶ δὴ παρῆκται σφάγια τάξεων πάρος.*³⁸

Again we have this mysterious emphasis on a very ordinary occurrence. Certainly there is matter here for astonishment "if it has no special bearing."

But let us not go too fast. We must consider if the verses do not after all fit in with the play as it is before we reject them because they do not fit in with the play as we think it ought to be. Euripides is a subtle worker and has to be watched carefully. He is not the man lightly to state the obvious. Yet here we find him not once, but *twice* dwelling on a very ordinary incident, in itself quite devoid of any significance. It is highly remarkable. But that may be the very reason why he introduced it. Its significance may well be extrinsic. If the modern scholar finds his attention caught by it and feels compelled to worry out an explanation of it, even to the point of changing the text, it is not unlikely that the enlightened Athenians of the time would react similarly and ask themselves, Why are we being told of this apparently trivial detail? It is also possible that some of them might hit upon the answer. The mention of the sacrifice (held immediately before the battle was joined) *fixes the time of the battle*. The other mention *fixes the approximate time at which Iolaus set out for the battlefield*. If we stop to indulge in comparisons, the result might prove extremely odious to

that *βόρειος* does not seem to occur elsewhere. [It is listed in the latest edition of Liddell and Scott (ed. Jones), the reference being to Grenfell, Hunt, Hogarth: *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri*, 107, 4.]

³⁸ Paley takes this to refer to the Argive army. See n. to v. 822. But why may it not refer to both sides?

Iolaus. From the Messenger's account we learn that Hyllus challenged Eurystheus to single combat but his gesture was ignored, immediately thereafter the priests performed the customary sacrifices and did so hurriedly, then the armies, after a brief word of exhortation from their leaders, came to grips in a tussle which was fierce but short, soon the Argives were in full flight, and then, mark it, then is the first mention of Iolaus, and it is a rather equivocal mention. What do we learn on the other hand from the account of the Servant? Since he seems to be unaware of the challenge of Hyllus, we may assume that he left the battlefield before that. On the other hand we learn that all the preparations for the sacrifices had been completed; the necessary paraphernalia had already been brought out in front of the ranks (673). Once Hyllus had returned to the ranks, little time would be wasted before the onset ensued. Meanwhile the Servant has to make his way back to the suppliants. By the time he has broken the good news to Iolaus he is already fearing that he will be too late for the fight. And little wonder; more valuable time has been lost by Alcmena's failure at first to recognise him, then follows the scene in which they all seek to dissuade the old man from his resolve, and off at last he goes, assisted by the servant who bemoans the snail's pace at which they are compelled to travel.³⁸ He must know by now that there is to be no fighting that day for him, nor for Iolaus. This might explain why Euripides introduces *another* servant to bring back the tale of victory; the first servant, and with him Iolaus, arrived very much *εἰς κάτοπιν ἐορτῆς*. And so is the *coup de grâce* administered to the myth of the miraculous rejuvenation of Iolaus. The youthfulness with which Euripides endows the old man is just a second childhood. He took no part in the battle, but, arriving when it was all over, was taken up into his chariot by Hyllus, who subsequently overtook and captured the fleeing Eurystheus. The whole miraculous story is fantastic fiction invented by minds disordered with the excitement of battle and accepted by minds scarcely less disordered. We do not need to go back two thousand years to realise that such a psychological phenomenon is by no means improbable. In this connection, also, notice vv. 344-345:

οὐκ ἂν λίποιμι βωμόν, εὐξόμεσθα δὲ
 ἰκέται μένοντες ἐνθάδ' εὖ πράξαι πόλιν.

It is Iolaus speaking, when Demophon is about to fight his battle for him. He will stay at the altar and pray for the success of Athens. It is as if Euripides is hinting how he would have treated Iolaus if he had been free to follow the dictates of probability, if there had been no stupid (but sacrosanct) tradition to explode.

These examples are, of course, merely incidental to our main contention, which does not depend on them, but may be conceded to derive additional support from them. Let us conclude by affirming that, properly regarded, the *Heraclidae*, though sorely mutilated and misunderstood, is well worthy of Euripides, both in conception and in execution. It would be easy also to pick out verses and phrases which need fear no comparison with the rest of our dramatist's work. What we have left of the play, after we have separated the chaff from the grain, is sufficient to show that it is a fine example of that strange blend of passionate idealism and scarifying rationalism which makes Euripides of all dramatists the most interesting to read and perhaps the most difficult to understand.

JOHN H. McLEAN.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

NOTE ON CICERO *ad Att.* 12, 46, 1.

In *A. J. P.* LV (1934), 77 Professor Frank makes the happy suggestion that the *octius* of the manuscripts represents a Greek verbal in -έος. I believe that *οἰστέος* would be even better than *ωστέος*, which he proposes. Paleographically it is as plausible, and it gives exactly the required sense. Note Eur. *Hel.* 268 *βὰρὸν μὲν, οἰστέον δ' ὅμως* and other references in the new Liddell and Scott. On the other hand *ωστέος* would mean, not 'must be repressed', but 'must be pushed', 'must be kept up.' Even if we should suppose it to be equivalent to *ἀπωστέος*, it would be strange psychologically. Cicero does not want to brush aside or repress his grief for Tullia so as to forget it and her entirely. He must cherish his grief for her along with her memory; the only thing to be done is to bear it.

L. A. POST.

Haverford College.

DOMITIAN'S INTENDED EDICT ON SACRIFICE OF OXEN.

Suetonius (*Dom.*, 9) is the only ancient writer who relates that Domitian once intended to issue an edict forbidding the sacrifice of oxen. He writes: "Inter initia usque adeo ab omni caede abhorrebat, ut absente adhuc patre recordatus Vergili versum:

‘Impia quam caesis gens est epulata iuvenis’

edicere destinavit, ne boves immolarentur." Commentators accept Suetonius' interpretation of the intended edict as evidence of a sentimental affection for animals on the part of Domitian in his youth.¹

This passage, however, is open to a different interpretation. The time when Domitian thought of issuing the edict is fixed by the phrase *absente adhuc patre*: it must have been sometime between the close of the civil wars in 69 and the return of Vespasian to Rome from Alexandria about October of 70.² The eighteen months of civil war had been terribly destructive for Italy, where "the march of the rival armies from the north to Rome had cut a red swathe through the fields which time and peace alone in due course could hide."³ There was justification for the statement of Civilis and Classicus that "the city and

¹ Cf., for example, Mooney's edition of the VII and VIII books of Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*, 1930, p. 550; Janssen, *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Vita Domitiani*, 1919, p. 45; Weinreich, *Studien zu Martial*, 1928, pp. 105-106: "Etwas sehr Eigentümliches berichtet Sueton über Domitians Verhalten zu Tieren. Ich meine nicht die Anekdote, dass er Mücken mit dem Griffel aufzuspiessen pflegte . . . sondern dass er Stieropfer als inhuman verbieten wollte. Und dabei berief er sich gerade auf einen Virgilvers, der für das goldene Zeitalter Altitaliens als Charakteristikum ausspricht, dass noch keine *impia gens* Rinder schlachtete. Wirken bei dieser Anwandlung in seiner ersten Regierungszeit neupythagorische Einflüsse und romantische Weltverbesserungsideen (Domitian als Bringer einer neuen *aurea aetas*) ineinander? Hatte er, den die *bruta animalia* verehrten, öfters ein gewisses Mitgefühl für sie gehabt?"

² Cf. Weynand, "*Flavius* (206)," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, VI (1909), col. 2648.

³ Henderson, *Five Roman Emperors*, 1927, p. 1.

Italy had been exhausted by internal warfare.”⁴ The livestock of Italy must have paid toll to the foraging of the troops. We know from the famous edict of Domitian regarding viticulture that he had an interest in economic conditions.⁵ It is, therefore, quite possible that he considered issuing an edict forbidding the sacrifice of oxen, not because of religion or sentiment, but in order to protect the depleted herds of Italy until they would have time to recover from the losses of the civil wars. There may, too, have been special danger to the oxen at this moment on account of vows made during the troubled period which had just come to an end, since those who had safely escaped the perils of the wars would desire to pay their vows, which in many cases may have called for the sacrifice of oxen.

KENNETH SCOTT.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY.

⁴ Tacitus, *Hist.*, IV, 75.

⁵ Cf. Frank, *An Economic History of Rome*, 2nd edition, 1927, p. 427 and Rostovzev, *Storia Economica e Sociale dell' Impero Romano*, 1933, p. 23, n. 17 and pp. 237-238.

OLD HIGH GERMAN SCRATCHED GLOSSES.

While searching through manuscripts in numerous Continental and English libraries for Old English glosses, I occasionally found unpublished Old High German glosses.¹ With the exception of a few, such that I came upon are scratched glosses.² The extensive search of manuscripts that was made in the preparing of the five volumes of *Die althochdeutschen Glossen* made it seem unlikely that many more Old High German glosses would ever come to light, yet since the appearance of the fifth volume in 1922 various publications have brought forth considerable new material.³ It is to this increasing sum of new glosses that this present contribution is made. As many of the scratched glosses here given are from a manuscript from which the inked glosses had been collected previously,⁴ without the mention of any of the scratched ones, it seems likely that other manuscripts which have been examined may yet contain unpublished glosses. Unless one were looking specifically for scratched glosses one might fail to notice them, especially if the supply of daylight was not at its best. But the careful scrutiny, in plenty of daylight, of manuscript leaves for words which may be scratched there without ink is at times rewarding.

¹ This work was made possible for me by a Research Fellowship with the American Council of Learned Societies.

² This method of glossing texts by scratching in words instead of writing them with ink I have discussed in *Old English Scratched Glosses in Cotton MS. Tiberius C. ii*, *AJPh.*, LIV. It is also spoken of by Napier, *Old English Glosses*, p. xxxiii, and Bischoff and Lehmann, *Nachträge zu den althochdeutschen Glossen*, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 52, 153 ff.

³ Recent publications of OHG. glosses: Naumann, *Glossen aus Admont*, *ZfdA.*, 64, pp. 77-79 (1927); Schröder, *Handschriftliche Funde von meinen Bibliotheksreisen*, *Nachrichten v. d. Ges. d. Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, phil.-hist. Klasse, p. 95 (1927); *Späalthochdeutsche Bibelglossen*, *ZfdA.*, 68, pp. 66-68 (1931); Lehmann, *Fuldaer Studien*, *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Klasse, p. 50 (1927); *Mitteilungen aus Handschriften*, ii, *MSBphKl.*, p. 35 f. (1930); Bischoff and Lehmann, *Nachträge zu den althochdeutschen Glossen*, *Beiträge*, 52, pp. 153 ff. (1928); Hartl, *Ein neues althochdeutsches Glossenfragment*, *Festschrift für Georg Leidinger*, pp. 95 ff. (1930); Pyritz, *Althochdeutsche Horaz-glossen*, *ZfdA.*, 68, pp. 215-16 (1931).

⁴ *Clm.* 6293. Cf. *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, 5, 66.

Staatsbibliothek, München

Cl. 6293, 9th century,⁵ 158 folios, ff. 1-65 Gregorii Dialogi
Migne, Patrol. Lat. 66 and 77

1v eminebat	furi uuas ⁶	11r opem helfoo	213, 16
	77, 152, 2	11v studiis lirnungon	
2v ut opinor	so uuaniu		66, 126, 8
3r contingere	pirinan	12v incole elilenti ¹³	128, 23
5v in tam ampla	in so	15v conspirantes kihantre ¹⁴	
	preiteru ⁷		136, 30
	nuper nunahiun ⁸	usum sito	136, 33
	subprimo piduingu	excederet arfori ¹⁵	136, 33
7r laccessiunt	kaarindent	17r inuitus kanotit	152, 43
	excreuerat aruuos	21v impetrant kahalont	194, 4
	reficiens ⁹ zuntenti	23r transfunderent	
	uidendum kasiuni ¹⁰	kafastinotin ¹⁶	198, 5
7v probat	cauuaignta	in spera ignea in suti	
8r crebro ofto			198, 27
9r ex obsessio	uona	exigua luzzil	198, 32
	pisessanemo ¹¹	24v ampliatur koprūtīt	200, 11
9v derogatione	lastrungu	liquide uuazure	200, 28
		25r acri pittro	202, 8
10v putandam ¹²	furpanne	sustentans stiurrente	
	212, 28		202, 13

⁵ The dates which I give for the MSS. are those assigned to them in the catalogues of the respective libraries.

⁶ There are traces of an immediately following gloss. If the position of a gloss is not referred to in the foot-notes, it is found above its lemma.

⁷ There is an illegible gloss above the immediately following *congregatione*.

⁸ Read *nu nahun*. Cf. *nuper nu*, Die ahd. Gl., 1, 216, 30; *nuper nahun*, 4, 9, 3; *nuper nu nahun*, 1, 285, 29.

⁹ Ed. *reficiendis . . . lampadibus*.

¹⁰ Under the Latin. The glossator has used a noun instead of following the gerund form of the Latin.

¹¹ In the writing *ss*, for *zz*, there may be attraction from the *ss* in the lemma.

¹² MS. *potandam*, but above *o* is scratched *u*.

¹³ In interpreting *eius loci incole* the glossator may have thought of *incole* as natives of some land other than his own, i. e. strangers.

¹⁴ Illegible at the end. Read *kihantreichhante*.

¹⁵ The unbroken *ō* in *arfori*, *hrodar* 34r, *armoti* 38r, *dursochenti* 39r, *sochan* 60r, and the dative ending *u* in *izzu* 43r, *nidarunku* 48r, *sonu* 52r, *sniumidu* 54r, *paru* 57r, point to a date hardly later than the beginning of the tenth century.

¹⁶ The glossator took the lemma as from *fundare* to make fast.

25v tendebatur	uuas kiuōrt	35v inquit chuatun	309, 37
	202, 20	compendiosa	
27v satis	kenuoc 77, 264, 13	kalimflihharo	309, 45
28r frigauit	reip 264, 32	36r calce spore ²⁴	312, 9
	frigaretur kiripan 264, 32	adnisu uuillin	312, 15
28v exenio ¹⁷	phrazumen 272, 36	expectaculum ²⁵	
29r saltim	doh 273, 3	uuntarsium	312, 19
31r euanuit	kileid 277, 21	36v tendendo ²⁶	
	respectus ursuni 277, 25	kidinnanne ²⁷	312, 29
32r retorqueat	kiride 280, 30	depraedati herionte	312, 36
32v transferre	frampringan	disponente kimarch ²⁸	
	297, 48		312, 43
34r rimis	hrodar ¹⁸ 304, 28	37r supplime ²⁹ furist	313, 22
34v caruisset	anuuari 305, 6	eminet opacuum	313, 26
	onustam kahlad ¹⁹ 305, 10	37v rarescunt kadunnet	313, 34
35r ausum	katurst 305, 25	paenitus zesperi	313, 33
	fateri sakenti ²⁰ 305, 27	38r aerumnam armoti	317, 25
	cogebatur uuas kipeit	uenit chuam	317, 25
	305, 27	perfrui pruhanti uuesan	
	exterius uzzaro ²¹ 309, 10		317, 28
	deliberasse kaendraftot	38v diffidunt missatruent	
	uuarin ²² 309, 17		320, 15
	conditione kiskēfti ²³	39r percontari dursochenti	
	309, 20		320, 36

¹⁷ Ed. *xenio*.

¹⁸ The glossator confused *rimis* with *remus*; cf. *rimis scruntussun*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 257, 27; *remus ruoder*, 4, 92, 1.

¹⁹ Illegible at the end. Read *kahladana*.

²⁰ The first letters *uu* of a following gloss, possibly *uuesan*, can be read but the gloss to the following *cogebatur* has been scratched over the rest of it and has obscured it.

²¹ A few illegible scratches follow.

²² As there is no connection between the lemma and gloss as they stand, I believe that the glossator took *deliberasse* as from *delibo*, and that *kaendraftot* is for *kaentraffot*. Under *raffen* in Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (11th edition) the existence of an OHG. *raffōn* is given as by chance unattested.

²³ Beneath the Latin.

²⁴ The gloss does not suit the lemma; perhaps there was confusion with *calcar* which in OHG. is rendered by *sporo*.

²⁵ Ed. *spectaculum*.

²⁶ In the MS. *tendendo* is corrected by a scratch to *tendendo*.

²⁷ Read *kidinsanne*.

²⁸ Illegible at the end; cf. *disponant kimarchoen*, Die ahd. Gl., 1, 277, 31.

²⁹ Ed. *sublime*.

40r facerem tati	325, 45	45r summi opificis meistris	
condiscensione ³⁰			344, 41
kizunft	325, 47	45v sculpta kakrapaniu	344, 42
40v incircumscribitum		limat fihlot	344, 44
unumpimerctan	328, 27	decubans hlinenti	345, 2
41v disponi pimarchon	329, 24	incrementa ouuast	345, 6
42r inquires chuidis	329, 43	46r refoueret kasatot	345, 30
ut opinor so ih uuaniu		fraglantia prunst	345, 37
	332, 8	uiaticum uuekanest	345, 39
obsistit uuidarstat	332, 9	46v exhiberentur uuarun	
questus es rochenti ³¹		karo ³²	345, 46
uuari	332, 11	elongata kilanctiu	345, 50
42v fassus sum ³²		replicabo piuendu	348, 4
sprehanti ³³	332, 22	47r coeuas ebanaltiu	348, 33
laxato lichtemo	332, 27	47v leue loso	348, 39
43r calore izzu ³⁴	340, 29	reuerenter rufendo	349, 10
deformatitis unupari		habitura farantiu	349, 13
	340, 31	48r dilationis kilengida ³⁵	
uerita est scamenti			357, 2
uuas, rehtiu ³⁶	340, 32	damno nidarunku	357, 3
foedaretur uuari		perfruuntur	
kazokan ³⁶	340, 33	sinzpruhanti ⁴⁰	357, 25
44r asciuit ³⁷ kiuuista	341, 11	geminata ⁴¹ kazuiualtot	
permittantur lopit	341, 24		357, 27
ambigo zuualon	341, 28		

³⁰ MS. *con discensione*. Below and close to the second part is scratched *con* and after this the gloss.

³¹ The first letter of the gloss might be read as *s*.

³² Ed. *praefatus sum*.

³³ Following this is a faint trace of a gloss, possibly *uuas*.

³⁴ Read *hizzu*.

³⁵ Over the first gloss is scratched the second one, seemingly an interpretation of *uerita* as *uera*.

³⁶ The glossator has misunderstood the lemma, possibly taking it as from *foederare*.

³⁷ Ed. *accivit*.

³⁸ The second part of this gloss is not clear in the MS. and the reading is doubtful.

³⁹ The meaning *dilatio* here distinguishes this gloss from *gilengida cognatio, affinitas* (Graff, *Sprachschatz*, 2, 225; Die ahd. Gl., 1, 272, 31). The present gloss corresponds in meaning with the lemma if it is taken as a nominal formation from *gilengan* to *protract*. Cf. *dilationis altisonis*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 139, 29 and *dilatio altinod*, 2, 259, 23.

⁴⁰ Reflecting the force of the Latin *per* is the prefix *sin* ever, entire as in *singrun* and *sinfluat*. The letter *z* between the *n* and *p* is perhaps a transition sound, similar to the *t* in forms such as *sintgrune* and *sintfluote* (Graff, *Sprachschatz*, 4, 299 and 3, 754).

⁴¹ Ed. *germinata*.

49v	rigorem suhti ⁴²	368, 21	56v	grabant suarent	396, 25
51r	exalans uf	384, 31		stipulam strau	396, 30
	probatio pichorunc	385, 1		adhibito zokihalatemo	
51v	auctoritate katursti	385, 18			396, 35
	sinceritate k . . liho ⁴³		57r	et luculenti enti	
		385, 19		leohtostin	396, 50
	coxas deoh	385, 24		extant sint	397, 1
	luctamen esset rinkanti ⁴⁴			refutauit uuidarstreit,	
		385, 26		uuidarota ⁵⁰	397, 9
52r	examine sōnu	385, 36		praesulis heroston	397, 11
	arbitris ⁴⁵ sonares	385, 36		feretro paru	397, 12
	latet pimitan ist	385, 37		dictauerunt lertun	397, 16
	uitare piuuisan	385, 46		sensi kahaneta	397, 23
	metallis kazimprun	388, 3	58r	fallerentur pitrogan	400, 22
	si ipu	388, 5	58v	temere katurstliho	400, 32
	ex eo ⁴⁶ fon diu	388, 6	59r	exute uzarfaraniu	401, 7
52v	uictu lipleitū	388, 24	59v	insanus unuuiser	401, 41
	fabrica zinprur	388, 27		adserere kasaken	401, 43
	non inmerito ni unkauu ⁴⁷		60r	expetere sochan	417, 1
		388, 27		diocaesi farru	417, 4
53r	ima nidaristun	388, 38		perageret durhteta	417, 14
	obsideat pisizzen	388, 45	60v	disparuit kaleid	417, 35
	infecit archelit ⁴⁸	389, 9	61r	sedule emazigo	420, 5
53v	necaret chueliti	389, 18		excubare kaanpahten	
	deridendo pihuhonto	389, 38			420, 6
54r	inguine hlanchun	389, 40		stipendiis lipleitun	420, 11
	protegerent scirmtin	389, 42	61v	percipiat antfahe	420, 29
	enixius langor	392, 1	62v	arcana uuihiu	421, 46
	caeleritate sniumidu	392, 2		mactabat plau	421, 46
55r	aestimationis chuiti	393, 17	63r	nauta ferio ⁵¹	424, 21
55v	abstrahit ⁴⁹ ziuhit	393, 34		rupto farprohanemo	424, 23
	ebibens trinken	393, 34		fune seile	424, 24
	non euasit ni entcheeng		63v	uictime friskinka	424, 33
		393, 39			

⁴² While in the MS. the first letter of the gloss appears to be s, it is very likely that one should read f. Cf. *rigor fuhti*, Die ahd. Gl., 4, 92, 46 and *rigor fuhti*, 4, 158, 17.

⁴³ Perhaps *katriulihho*.

⁴⁴ After *rinkanti* comes *uu* and a trace of more; possibly *uuari*.

⁴⁵ Ed. *arbitri*.

⁴⁶ Ed. *per hoc*.

⁴⁷ Illegible at the end. Perhaps *unkauuerdot*.

⁴⁸ Scratched over and running into the letters of this gloss is a gloss which I could not read.

⁴⁹ Ed. *extrahit*.

⁵⁰ The first gloss is above the lemma, the second is beneath it.

⁵¹ Here and also in *herionte*, 36v, the letter *i* is made with a much longer stroke than elsewhere in these glosses.

restaurata kazehotiu		funditus karo	425, 1
	424, 34	64v ima nidarostun	428, 3
quo oblata ⁵² demo		65r eruemus ⁵⁴ arlaosemes	
kaoffarotiu	424, 34		428, 13
inopinata		incuria unrohun	428, 15
unpiuuanelih	424, 36	65v placitum sona	428, 37
uersatus fargozzan	424, 41	fidenter paldliho	429, 7
carine mastes ⁵³	424, 43		

Cl. 6272, ninth century, 184 folios, Hieronymus in Matthaum
Migne, Patrol. Lat. 26

35r prerogatiuam era ⁵⁵	52, 6	cautione scrip ⁶⁰	150, 35
50r gehenon hel- ⁵⁶	66, 29	tecnam suih	150, 39
87v os mund	106, 36	130r malo afol	155, 4
109v arbitratus est son- ⁵⁷		nodo masor	155, 4
	130, 40	153v gemma proz	180, 37
rapina urtof. ⁵⁸	130, 40	intellegitis uuiztut	180, 38
126v rursum empta ⁵⁹ urchuft		176v roseo ⁶¹ rot	208, 24
	150, 29	limbo tuhh- ⁶²	208, 24

Cl. 4554, 8/9th century, 164 folios, Passiones Sanctorum
Acta Sanctorum Jan. tom. 1 and 2

110r inpedistis ⁶³ camartut	111r piget trac ⁶⁴	586, 16
	1, 585, 29	154v gradum castegail 2, 717, 23

⁵² Ed. *oblato*.

⁵³ This is an incorrect interpretation of *carine*, which means *keel* and *ship*, not *mast*. Cf. *carine. naue. scalmo. po dame*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 258, 59.

⁵⁴ Ed. *servemus*. In the MS. *eruemus* begins a line and the *s* is left attached at the end of the preceding line.

⁵⁵ With the exception of the interlinear gloss *masor*, 130r, all glosses from this MS. are marginal.

⁵⁶ Read *hella*.

⁵⁷ Read *sona*.

⁵⁸ Read *urtoffi*. Cf. *temeritas paldi. urtoffi*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 332, 67.

⁵⁹ MS. *membra*, deleted by dots, and *empta* written in darker ink above.

⁶⁰ Cf. *cautio scripgezuch*, Die ahd. Gl., 3, 313, 25.

⁶¹ Ed. *rufo*.

⁶² Perhaps one should read *tuhhil*; cf. *peplo, pallio tuhil*, Die ahd. Gl. 2, 569, 22 and *strophium tuhil*, 2, 569, 39.

⁶³ Ed. *irretistis*.

⁶⁴ There is no trace of more in the MS. Read *tracot*.

Stiftsbibliothek, St. Gallen

MS. 217, 9th century, 342 pages, pp. 1-249 Gregorii Cura
Pastoralis

Migne, Patrol. Lat. 77

p. 18 dedecore	unscenin	19, 34	p. 130 fomentis	fascun	71, 38
p. 32 horum ⁶⁵	ire ⁶⁶	24, 50	p. 150 supersticione		
p. 63 torpescit	caslauet ⁶⁷	39, 8		ubarmezzikin ⁶⁸	81, 50
p. 74 effrenata	unzapritlota ⁶⁸	44, 5	p. 208 conglutinata		
p. 116 suspitionibus	uuanun		pichliban ⁷⁰		108, 28
		64, 49			

Stadtbibliothek, St. Gallen

MS. 312, 10th century, 158 folios, Horati Opera
Keller and Holder, Horati Opera

90v sicarius mxchfrk ⁷¹ 2, 34, 4

Universitätsbibliothek, Würzburg

Mp. th. f. 19, 8/9th century, 97 folios, Gregorii Dialogi

Migne, Patrol. Lat. 77

8v ferramentum id est	48v uangas .i.scuuala	245, 23
bluothisan ⁷² flebotomum		
	169, 28	

Bodleian Library, Oxford

MS. Auct. T. 2. 22, 10th century, 128 folios, Prudentii
Carmina ⁷³

Migne, Patrol. Lat. 59 and 60

26r maculis	mascun	59, 799, 15	48r callum	suil	389, 4
44r calyps	stahel	60, 288, 3	51v ludibria	spil	403, 8

⁶⁵ MS. *exorum*, with *h* written above.

⁶⁶ In left margin preceded by reference mark *h*.

⁶⁷ In right margin.

⁶⁸ In left margin. Read *ungapritlota*.

⁶⁹ Cf. *supersticio ubermezzichi*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 96, 53.

⁷⁰ In left margin.

⁷¹ In ink, in 10th century hand that has put in many Latin glosses.
Read *mucheri*.

⁷² Read *bluotisarn*. The two glosses from this MS. are in ink.

⁷³ From this MS. six glosses not given here are noted by Lehmann, *Mitteilungen aus Handschriften*, MSBphKl., p. 36 (1930). The glosses are in ink.

82v prurit iuchit	313, 4	98r trulla kella	471, 4
scalpit skebit	313, 5	119v fragitidas ⁷⁴	bregkun 525, 12
strumas kelca	313, 8		

Universitätsbibliothek, Basel

MS. F III 15 c, 8th century, 62 folios, Isidorus de Synonymis,
Sancti Basilii Admonitio ad Filium Spiritualem ⁷⁵

Migne, Patrol. Lat. 83 and 103

12r relegio eua ⁷⁶	83, 845, 28 ⁷⁷	24r nec modicum ni galie ⁸⁴	
14r interime ⁷⁸ slah ⁷⁹	848, 39		862, 43
16v ultor reh hari ⁸⁰	852, 23	24v (nullim) defendas ni	
17v ad reconciliationem		scirmi ⁸⁵	863, 35
zigidingon ⁸¹	853, 22	27r nec quod ni desiu	867, 19
18v tribulatione arpeiti ⁸²		28v uite huius disses lipes	
	854, 38		103, 685, 39
21r celari bimidan ⁸³	859, 5	29r deuersus ⁸⁶ meslihhen	
21v si opa	859, 19		686, 15
te dih	859, 20	res ⁸⁶ dingun	686, 15
23r inpertienda ziteilen ⁸³		lucrum gięri	686, 20
	861, 19		

⁷⁴ Ed. *sphragitidas*.

⁷⁵ The glosses here given are from a copy which I made in the spring of 1932. On seeing the MS. again some months later, I found that an attempt had been made to trace in many of the scratched glosses with pencil. This has made it impossible to read again these glosses as originally scratched in the MS.

⁷⁶ After *eua* there is a trace of a gloss under *peruersa*. In the right margin opposite *nihil . . . offendas* is the beginning of a gloss, *nigi*. Most of the glosses in this MS. occur either above or below their respective lemmata; I give the position of those only which occur elsewhere.

⁷⁷ Only lines of the text, not notes or chapter-headings, are included in the lines counted.

⁷⁸ Ed. *interimunt*.

⁷⁹ Right margin.

⁸⁰ Although the form of letters in scratched glosses is apt to be irregular, this gloss and others bear evidence of a pointed insular hand. In the left margin of this folio are several scratched glosses difficult to read. One seems to be Latin *mitiga* which occurs in the text nearby. Another I read with doubt as *resci gipur*, glossing the neighboring (*iracundia*) *praeoccuparit*.

⁸¹ Top margin.

⁸² Left margin.

⁸³ Right margin.

⁸⁴ Following this is a gloss of which I could read the first letters *nis*, perhaps *ni sat* glossing *nec satis* which follows *modicum*.

⁸⁵ MS. *niscirmi*. In left margin.

⁸⁶ Ed. *in diversis rebus*.

29v et enti ⁸⁷	686, 26	erroribus irridon	687, 21
abominare leidene	686, 27	uagaremur ueruallot	
mendacium lugia ⁸⁸	686, 28		687, 21
ab omni stultitia fon		exquesiuit sohita	687, 24
allemo ungi ⁸⁹	686, 31	31v detinetur giuestinot ⁹⁴	
obtinere bihaben	686, 35		688, 46
et . . eius entes gotes ⁹⁰		33v fraudes feihnes ⁹⁵	690, 49
	686, 38	34r facultates ehti	691, 37
inpensius ingiuegan ⁹¹		35v aliquod ⁹⁶ einig	693, 5
	686, 39	37r disciplinas ⁹⁷ lera	694, 22
meditaueris ⁹² lere	686, 39	et iusit ⁹⁸ enti gipot	
eris bist	686, 39		694, 36
et ex seruo en . .		38v fulgere scinen	695, 43
deotome ⁹³	686, 42	39r molestia ⁹⁹ suernessa	
30r obnoxios scadonti	687, 20		696, 18

HERBERT MERITT.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

⁸⁷ There is a trace of following letters under *tumorem*.

⁸⁸ Read *lugina*.

⁸⁹ Perhaps *ungiuiizili*.

⁹⁰ Read *enti gotes*. *eius* refers to *dei*.

⁹¹ Cf. *de inpenso fona unkauuekanemo*, Die ahd. Gl., 2, 307, 5.

⁹² Ed. *meditatus eris*.

⁹³ The traces of two or three intervening letters are visible.

⁹⁴ In left margin.

⁹⁵ The ending *es* of the gloss may be by attraction from the ending of the lemma, or perhaps the glossator took *fraudes* as genitive.

⁹⁶ Ed. *quoddam*.

⁹⁷ Ed. *disciplinis*.

⁹⁸ Ed. *iussis*.

⁹⁹ Ed. *molestiam*.

EUMENIUS AND THE SCHOOLS OF AUTUN.

In these days of robust faith in the power of governments to cure all human ills the student of Roman history may well consider with especial care the efforts of Diocletian and his colleagues to repair the damage wrought in the Roman world by the disasters of the Military Anarchy. Of this policy, which proved the occasion for the carving of so many extant building inscriptions, our most interesting and informative literary reminder is the oration in which the Gallic rhetorician Eumenius describes the restoration of his native city of Augustodunum and especially of its famous Maenian schools. Before entering upon a discussion of this work one may well recount, for the sake of the possible reader to whom Eumenius may be unfamiliar ground, a bare outline of the facts with which the oration has to do. Augustodunum (the modern Autun) was after the reign of Augustus the political centre of the Haeduan people. Its schools had been famous as a rendezvous for the sons of Gallic aristocrats as early as the reign of Tiberius, when the students figured in the revolt of Sacrovir (Tacitus, *Annals* III, 43-46). Thereafter nothing is known of the state of the schools for considerably more than two centuries, although they seem to have flourished until about the middle of the third century A. D. In 269, however, city and schools alike suffered an overwhelming blow. Gaul was at that time a part of the domains of the usurper Tetricus; and Augustodunum declared for the legitimate emperor, Claudius Gothicus. As he was unable to render effective aid to his Gallic partisans, the city was besieged for seven months by the soldiers of Tetricus, and when captured was completely destroyed (*Incerti Gratiarum Actio Constantino Aug.*, IV, 2, in *Panegy. Lat.*, ed. Baehrens). Although it probably revived to some extent during the three decades that followed, and a few students no doubt continued to frequent the schools, the effects of the catastrophe were still apparent when in 297 Constantius Chlorus undertook a comprehensive program of rehabilitation. Every effort was made to restore the prosperity of the city (*Pro Instaurandis Scholis*, IV, in *Panegy. Lat.*); and when the head of the Maenian schools died, Constantius appointed Eumenius, his *magister memoriae*, to fill the

vacancy, and to undertake the restoration of the schools to their former condition. For this service Eumenius was to receive a stipend of 600,000 sesterces a year, which he generously dedicated to the reconstruction of the buildings. The oration (commonly called *Pro Instaurandis Scholis*) from which these facts are gleaned was delivered before the governor of the province of Lugdunensis Prima, at the time that the new head of the Maenian schools entered upon his position. But as so frequently happens with source-documents, this oration, in spite of the positive information which it furnishes and the provocative hints which it throws out, raises a good many questions which it does not satisfactorily answer. Among them is that of the relative degrees of control exercised over the schools of Autun by the municipal and imperial authorities; and closely allied to it is that of the source from which Eumenius' salary was derived. It is the purpose of this study to consider these questions, supplementing the information furnished by Eumenius himself from other sources whenever possible.

C. Jullian (*Histoire de la Gaule*, VIII, pp. 248-9) states what appears to be the commonly accepted opinion on these points in the following words: "The city paid the professors; but the emperor determined the amount of their stipends, settling it upon the city budget. . . . They themselves were appointed by the local senate; but the prince did not give up the right to control their choice or to force his own upon them, particularly when the head of the school or its outstanding professor was concerned" (translation). In other words, the city bore the whole burden of supporting the schools, and controlled the selection of the teaching personnel except when the emperor chose to interfere. That institutions of higher learning were in the main controlled and financed by local initiative there can be no doubt; but the present writer cannot agree to the statement that imperial interference in the selection of teachers was wholly arbitrary and unregulated by law. The case of Eumenius admits of a better explanation, and one more in keeping with the available evidence.

The ordinary teacher in a provincial school was a municipal employe, paid out of the city budget, and in some cases enjoying important privileges from the imperial government. This continued to be true up to and long after the reign of Diocletian,

as the law-codes clearly prove (*Codex Just.*, X, 53, 2: "Grammaticos seu oratores decreto ordinis probatos, si non se utiles studentibus praebeant, denuo ab eodem ordine reprobari posse incognitum non est"—Law of Gordian III., the inclusion of which in the Justinian Code proves that it was still in force in the sixth century. *Ibid.*, X, 53, 7: "quisquis docere vult, non repente nec temere presiliat ad hoc munus, sed iudicio ordinis probatus decretum curialium mereatur, optimorum conspirante consensu"—Law of Julian). But the imperial government very early took a hand in regulating the schools, both at Rome and in the provinces; and at the peril of repeating what is to be found in many hand-books and classical encyclopedias, one may well at this point recapitulate what is known about the development and working of its educational policy.

Vespasian seems to have begun the practice of paying Greek and Latin rhetoricians out of the imperial treasury—probably only in Rome and a few other places (Suetonius, *Vesp.*, 18, 1). Hadrian continued and expanded it, at the same time attempting to improve the service by pensioning off incompetents (Spartianus, *Hadr.*, 16, 3). Antoninus Pius went further, providing salaries for some at least of the teachers in the provincial schools, and attempting to coordinate imperial patronage with municipal educational efforts (Capitolinus, *Ant. Pius*, 11, 3). With this end in view he extended immunity from the personal and pecuniary liturgical services due to the government to a limited number of teachers of each class in each city. Three classes of municipalities were distinguished, and the numbers of teachers to whom immunity might be granted varied accordingly. The highest class was that of provincial metropolises; the second, assize towns; and the third, all others (Modestinus in *Digest*, XXVII, 1, 6). Augustodunum might be fairly presumed to have belonged to the second class. It is also fair to suppose that those so favored were hired and paid by the municipalities. The regulations established by Antoninus, perhaps with some few modifications, were in force in the reign of Diocletian, and would naturally govern a school like the *Maeniana* of Augustodunum. Let us see if we can apply what we know about them to the case of Eumenius.

The whole of the oration *Pro Instaurandis Scholis*, and in particular the letter of Constantius quoted in chapter 14, proves

beyond a doubt that Eumenius had been appointed by his imperial master to hold the headship of the Maenian schools, and to teach rhetoric there. Was this a usurpation of authority, or was Constantius acting in accordance with existing law? The answer to this question can best be determined by a careful analysis of the available data regarding his salary. Both in chapter 11 and in the letter of Constantius we are told that he was to be paid "*ex huius rei publicae viribus*." Allowing that in the later Empire the term *res publica* had come to mean pretty definitely a municipality, modern scholars have jumped to the conclusion that this sum was to be taken directly and finally from the municipal budget (Jullian, *op. cit.*, VIII, p. 249. Bloch, in Lavissee's *Histoire de la France*, I, part II, p. 392). It does not appear that this was true. In chapter 3 of the same oration the speaker says: "*Disseram . . . deinde qua ratione id possit sine sumptu publico ex largitione quidem principum maximorum — procedere*." It would seem, then, that Eumenius considered his salary as coming ultimately from the imperial treasury, although paid immediately by the city. The most plausible reconciliation of the data, it would seem, would be to suppose that the city treasury paid the salary and deducted the sum from its quota of taxes. This would be the natural practice to follow in a time of primitive banking arrangements, when it was not possible to mail checks to imperial employees in distant cities, and when some or all of the amount in question may have been paid in kind.

Another point which must not be ignored is the probable amount of Eumenius' stipend. Here, unfortunately, we are not able to proceed with any absolute certainty, and must depend upon indirect evidence. What was the monetary value of 600,000 sesterces in Diocletian's day, and how did it compare with the ordinary salary of a municipal teacher? At the time of Augustus the sesterce had been reckoned as one-fourth of a denarius, twenty-five denarii as equivalent to an aureus, and forty-two aurei to a pound of gold. But this was not the rate prevailing in the reign of Diocletian. Chaos had reigned in the field of coinage for a long time before his accession; and his reign was spent in a series of fruitless experiments designed to restore it to order. Some very respectable modern authorities seem convinced that it is impossible to determine exactly what

sum the rhetorician's salary represents, and look upon it only as an indication that he belonged to the highest salaried group of the Roman civil service (Regling, in Pauly-Wissowa, s. v. "Sesterz"). The Edict of Prices reckons 50,000 copper denarii to a pound of gold; and some have decided from this that the sesterce still represented the fourth part of a denarius (therefore one two-hundred-thousandth of a pound of gold), and that accordingly three-hundred thousand sesterces would be but one and a half pounds of gold, and Eumenius' salary as head of the school of Augustodunum only three pounds. To accept this latter explanation we must be prepared to believe that the value of the salary of a *trecentarius* had between the reigns of Augustus and Diocletian declined in terms of gold from nearly seventy-two pounds to a pound and a half, or ninety-seven and eight-tenths percent, most of the devaluation taking place in the fifty years preceding Diocletian's accession, and that the imperial government had done nothing to offset the decline. This is inherently improbable, and becomes much more so if one remembers that so drastic a slash in official salaries would have made possible a marked reduction in the burden of taxation; whereas it is quite evident that during this very period it became much heavier than before. In view of this fact it appears necessary to abandon the theory that the sesterce in the reign of Diocletian represented a fourth of the copper denarius, and to strike out along a new line. What was the average level of pay in the imperial service during the later Empire, and how did it compare with that of the first two centuries of the Principate?

For the early fourth century there is practically no reliable evidence; but for the late fourth, fifth, and early sixth centuries we possess a considerable number of facts which, if we bear in mind the essentially conservative character of Roman and early Byzantine society, may be of help. In the reign of Domitian (81-96 A. D.) a legionary soldier received twelve aurei, or four-fifteenths of a pound of gold, a year. In 375 Valentinian I set the rate at thirty solidi, or five-twelfths of a pound (*Codex Theod.*, VII, 13, 7. The sum mentioned is the amount payable in commutation of military service: six solidi for the maintenance of a substitute, and thirty for his pay). In the later fifth century two *advocati fisci* in the East received sixty pounds of gold apiece annually (*Codex Just.*, II, 7, 25, a law of Justin

referring to conditions in the reign of Zeno, 474-491 A. D.). In the reign of Justinian the Praetorian Prefect of Africa received a hundred pounds of gold a year, and his advisers twenty pounds each (*Ibid.*, I, 27, 1). Dukes in the African provinces received about twenty-two pounds of gold apiece annually (*Ibid.*, I, 27, 2). In other words, the pay of imperial soldiers and officials seems to have been maintained at a very high standard in terms of gold under the later Empire; and we have no evidence of decline between. It would indeed be perilous to be dogmatic upon so confused a subject; but it seems much more likely that the sesterce represents the *antoninianus*, four of which at one time in the reign of Diocletian equalled a silver denarius, and one hundred of which were equivalent to an aureus tarified at a sixtieth of a pound of gold (Jones, *Companion to Roman History*, p. 346). If this were so, Eumenius' salary as *magister memoriae* would have been fifty pounds of gold, which was doubled when he assumed control of the school of Augustodunum. This is, of course, a mere hypothesis; but it is certainly far more in harmony with existing data than the alternative just considered, which assumes that the salaries of the great officials of the imperial court were tied irrevocably to a depreciating currency. At any rate, the salary of an imperial secretary must have been not far from the figure mentioned; and it will serve as a basis of comparison with the stipends of ordinary rhetoricians for the purpose of attempting to determine by what authority Eumenius was paid.

When in 376 A. D. the imperial government set the salaries of rhetoricians and grammarians to be paid by metropolitan cities of the diocese of Gaul, the former were allowed twenty-four *annonae* and the latter twelve, which Jullian plausibly reckons at ninety-six and forty-eight *solidi* respectively, counting seventy-two *solidi* to a pound of gold (*Codex Theod.*, XIII, 3, 11. For Jullian's estimate of monetary value, cf. *Histoire de la Gaule*, VIII, p. 248, n. 6). This is a far cry from the salaries of imperial officials, if the data cited above are any basis of comparison. Indeed, it is hardly likely that Constantius, who was noted for his kindness to the provincials, and who was just at this time making every effort to revive the prosperity of Augustodunum, would have saddled upon the city government a burden so much larger than the ordinary pay of a professor.

The disparity is too great, when all allowance is made for the favored position of Eumenius, to make it probable that he was paid by a mere municipal curia.

Aside from the question of salary, strong proof that the appointment was considered a legitimate exercise of imperial authority is found in the fact that the oration from which our information comes was delivered before the provincial governor, and that no mention is made of the curia of Augustodunum other than as the recipients of a lucky windfall. Had it been a case of usurpation of authority, the letter of Constantius would doubtless have been directed to the curia, and pitched in a very different key. All in all, we should, it seems, see in this case an example of the "state-aid" system of Antoninus Pius.

It is also in order to ask whether, allowing that Eumenius was hired and paid by the imperial government, the headship of the *Maeniana* was regularly filled in this manner. Apparently not; for Eumenius seems clearly to mark his own appointment as an exceptional case in the history of the school ("Cui enim umquam veterum principum tantae fuit curae ut doctrina atque eloquentiae studia florerent quantae his optimis et indulgentissimis dominis generis humani?—qui nobilissimam istam indolem Galliarum suarum interitu summi doctoris orbatam respicere dignati—" *Pro Inst. Sch.*, V, 2-3). The circumstances which led Constantius to this action were no doubt the desperate plight of the school and the danger that it would die out altogether; and it would be natural for the imperial government to reserve its bounty for such cases.

The case of Eumenius is of importance to us, not merely because it illustrates the opportunities for advancement open to men of education in the fourth century, but also because it throws light upon the relations of the imperial and local governments in the field of education. From it we learn something of the efforts of the emperors after the Military Anarchy to stimulate to new life the half-ruined school-system of the provinces; and it also furnishes us with a knowledge of its more kindly patronage to balance the stern edict of Constantine against those who mistreated teachers or withheld their pay (*Codex Theod.*, XIII, 3, 1), or the minimum salary scale of Gratian (*Ibid.*, XIII, 3, 11). The government of Diocletian was seeking to supplement local enterprise where local resources

were unequal to the task; and in so doing it seems to have followed the precedents set for it by earlier emperors. Augustodunum never again became a celebrated centre of learning; but imperial patronage and encouragement bore worthy fruit in other Gallic schools throughout the fourth century; and ultimately these played a large part in imparting Roman civilization to the Germanic tribes who were to transform Gaul into France.

C. E. VAN SICKLE.

OHIO WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

THE ORIGIN OF PRONOUNS OF THE FIRST AND SECOND PERSON.

There was in all probability a period in the primitive development of languages when there were no personal pronouns, and when persons speaking referred to themselves, to those whom they addressed, and to those about whom they spoke, by their proper names, just as a child says "Johnnie (= I) wants to go with Papa (= you) to see Grandma (= her)."

Pronouns of the third person were doubtless first developed, demonstrative words meaning 'this' or 'that' being very naturally used instead of repeating the name of the person spoken of.

The method of the development of pronouns of the first and second persons is not so self-evident, but they must also have been evolved from expressions normally denoting the third person, as it is hardly conceivable that primitive man would have invented directly expressions for the highly abstract ideas of 'I' and 'thou'. This primitive function of the third person in serving as a representative of the first and second is still alive in many languages, perhaps in all. For example a mother speaking to her little son might say "*Mother* won't hurt *him*. *She* loves *her little man*", where *mother* and *she* are semantically first person, and *him* and *her little man*, second person.

There are at least four kinds of third personal expressions from which pronouns of the first and second persons might be developed, viz.:

- 1) proper names of persons speaking or spoken to: (this case is conceivable, but so far as I know, there is no evidence for it).
- 2) common nouns meaning "person" or "human being" representing persons speaking or spoken to: pronouns of this type are German *man* and French *on*, which may refer to any one of the three persons.
- 3) common nouns meaning "servant" or the like for first person and "lord" or "master" for the second: the classic examples here are Malay *sahaya* 'I' and *tuan* 'you'.¹

¹ Cf. W. E. Maxwell, *A Manual of the Malay Language*, 6th ed., London (1902), pp. 48-50.

- 4) demonstrative pronouns; either general demonstratives like French *ce* used for both first and second persons, or nearer demonstratives used for first person, and more remote demonstratives for the second.

The general method of development in all these cases was to give these third personal expressions referring to the speaker or the person addressed a first or second personal meaning by a wrong division of the semantic content of these expressions. That is to say, the meaning of first or second person, which belonged originally only to the situation of speaking or being spoken to, infects by contact the third personal expression with its first or second personal flavor, so that it finally comes to stand independently of the situation as a full-fledged expression for 'I', 'you', etc.

There are of course many pronouns of the first and second person that defy analysis; this fact is not surprising, when one considers the many centuries of development that lie behind any form of speech that we have today. There are many, however, whose forms indicate more or less certainly a connection with the roots of demonstrative pronouns, and it is this group which is the subject of the present discussion.

In the Semitic languages² the pronoun of the first person singular was originally *ana* or *anâku*, the expression for the possessive 'my' was the suffix *-ia*, and that for the objective 'me' was the suffix *-nî*. The nearer demonstrative in Babylonian-Assyrian is *annû*, the first element of which, *an* is probably identical with the first part *an* of both forms of the independent first personal pronoun; the suffix *-ia* appears with third personal force as the preformative (inflectional element) of the Semitic imperfect, e. g., Arabic, from a root *qatal* 'kill' makes an imperfect third person singular *ia-qtulu*. The accusative suffix *-nî* is probably connected with the element *-na* which with varying vocalization appears in many demonstratives, e. g., Biblical Aramaic *de-nâ*, Assyrian *an-nû*.

The pronoun of the first person plural apparently had the original form *nahna*, with demonstrative particle *na* both pre-

² Cf. C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss d. Vergleichenden Gram. d. Semitischen Sprachen*, Bd. I, Berlin (1908), pp. 297-313, 316-326, 559-576; J. Barth, *Die Pronominalbildung in d. Semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig (1913).

fixed and affixed to a laryngeal element identical with Arabic unpointed *hah*. This laryngeal *h* apparently occurs also combined with the demonstrative particle *ka* in Ethiopic *kaḥā*, *kaḥaka*, *keḥka* 'thither', some of whose forms present the same pattern as the pronoun of the second person plural; for example Ethiopic *neḥna* 'we' is identical in pattern with the last form *keḥka*, each having the element *h* flanked by the same forms of two different demonstrative elements, respectively *na* and *ka*.

The independent pronouns of the second person, singular and plural, contain the same initial element *an* as the independent pronouns of the first person singular, combined with another demonstrative particle whose characteristic element is *t*, e. g., Arabic *an-ta*, *an-ti* 'thou', *an-tum*, *an-tunna* 'ye', which *t* element is doubtless the same as the *ti* of Arabic *ti-lka* 'that'. The basis of the suffixes that denote the possessive 'thy', 'your' and the accusative 'thee', 'you' is a different demonstrative element *k*, appearing with varied vocalization, e. g., Arabic singular *-ka*, *-ki*, plural *kum*, *kunna*. This particle *k*, which we have just met as an element of Ethiopic *kaḥaka* 'thither', is a characteristic element of the remoter demonstrative pronoun in several Semitic languages, e. g., Biblical Aramaic *dēk*, *dāk* 'that', Arabic *ḏāka*, Ethiopic *zekû* 'that'.

The Indo-European personal pronouns of the first and second persons are based on the following particles,³ viz:

- 1 sg. Greek and Latin *eg-*
Indo-European *me*
- 1 pl. Indo-European *ue*, *ne*
- 2 sg. Indo-European *te*, *te-ue*
- 2 pl. Indo-European *iu*, *ue*

The most striking similarity between these forms and demonstrative forms is that between *te* of the 2 sg. and the common Indo-European demonstrative particle *to*. The particle 1 pl. *ne* perhaps occurs in Sanskrit *ena* 'that one, he'. The particle *ue* of both 1 and 2 pl. may perhaps be found in Sanskrit demonstrative adverbs *e-vam*, *i-va*. The 2 pl. *iu* is perhaps the same as the common relative pronoun *iō*. The Graeco-Latin particle *eg* of 1 sg. is perhaps identical with Latin *ec* for *eg* in *ec-ce*

³ Cf. K. Brugmann, *Kurze Vergleichende Gram. d. Indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg (1904), pp. 399-413, §§ 494-525.

'behold' and *ec-cum* (< **eg-hum*).⁴ The close connection between demonstrative particles and particles meaning 'behold, see', is not only *a priori* probable, but is clearly evident from Semitic, where Syriac *hâ* 'behold' is evidently identical with the wide-spread demonstrative particle *ha*,⁵ and where Arabic conjunction *anna* 'that', doubtless derived from a demonstrative like English conjunction *that*,⁶ is undoubtedly the same as Arabic *inna*, Hebrew *hinnê* 'behold'.

Resemblances between pronouns of first and second persons and demonstrative particles in other groups of languages⁷ are, e. g.:

Personal.	Demonstrative.
Tagalog 2 sg. <i>i-yo</i>	<i>yo-on</i>
General Philippine 1 and 2. <i>ta</i>	Pampanga <i>i-ta</i> Pangasinan <i>sa-ta-n</i>
Turkish <i>ben</i> 'I'	<i>bu</i> 'this'
<i>sen</i> 'thou'	<i>su</i> 'his'
Hungarian 2 p. <i>te, ti</i>	<i>itt</i> 'here' <i>ott</i> 'there'
Finnish 1 sg. <i>minu</i>	<i>tamä</i> 'this'
2 sg. <i>sinu</i>	<i>se</i> 'that'
Singhalese <i>mama</i> 'I'	<i>me</i> 'this'
Suaheli (E. Africa) 2 sg. <i>wewe</i>	<i>wa</i>
Oshindonga (S. W. Africa) 1 sg. <i>ndi</i>	<i>ndi</i> 'this'
Carrier Indian <i>nyen</i> 'thou'	<i>nyui, nyunen</i> 'that' (all with <i>ny</i> initial)
Wiraturai (Australian) 1 sg. <i>ngatu</i>	{ <i>ngidi, ngina, ngugu, ngadi, ngana,</i> <i>2 sg. ngindu</i> } { <i>ngagu, ngila</i> (all with <i>ng</i> initial)

⁴ Contrast A. Walde, *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2. Aufl., Heidelberg (1910), p. 249.

⁵ Cf. Brockelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 316.

⁶ Cf. Barth, *op. cit.* p. 102.

⁷ Cf. F. R. Blake, "Contributions to Comparative Philippine Grammar," *J. A. O. S.*, 27 (1906) [Pronouns derived from particles], pp. 337-396; K. Wied, *Anleitung zur Erlernung der Türkischen Sprache*, 5. Aufl. (Hartleben), pp. 26, 29, 34 f.; F. Görg, *Lehrbuch d. Ungarischen Sprache*, 11. Aufl. (Hartleben), p. 51; F. v. Ney, *Ungarische Sprachlehre*, 27. Aufl., Budapest (1903), p. 23; M. Wellewill, *Gram. d. Finnischen Sprache*, 2. Aufl. (Hartleben), pp. 35, 40; A. Seidel, *Die Suahilisprache*, 3. Aufl. (= Koch's *Sprachführer*, Bd. 22), Dresden u. Leipzig (1912), pp. 9, 12; A. Seidel, *Praktische Grammatiken d. Hauptsprachen Deutsch-Südwest-Africas*, 2. Aufl. (Hartleben), pp. 136, 138; A. G. Morice, *The Carrier Language*, Vienna (1932) [= *Anthropos Linguistische Bibliothek IX*], Vol. I, pp. 159, 169; F. Müller, *Grundriss d. Sprachwissenschaft*, Wien (1882-1886), Bd. II, 1, pp. 20, 21; III, 1, pp. 148, 150 and note.

Many other examples of correspondence between first and second personal pronouns on the one hand and demonstrative forms on the other could doubtless be cited, but enough has been said, I think, to show that many traces of one of the most primitive of linguistic processes, viz., the infection of demonstrative particles with first and second personal meaning, through wrong division of the semantic content of expressions for the speaker and the person addressed, are still to be found after milleniums of time in languages as we have them today.

FRANK R. BLAKE.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

ON THE COMPOSITION OF XENOPHON'S *HELLENICA*.

(Continued from Page 139)

PART II.

There are two passages, Dion. Hal. *Epist. ad Cn. Pomp.* 4, 1 and Marcell. *Vit. Thuc.* 45, which are very frequently taken to prove that our *Hellenica* consists of two originally separate parts. Hatzfeld, *op. cit.*, 114-17, studies these passages carefully, and finds that this conclusion cannot justifiably be drawn from them. Some of the points he makes may be questioned, but there is no disputing his general conclusion. In this connection see also Volckmar, *De Xen. Hell. comment. hist.-crit.* (1837), 14-15. The ordinary interpretation of these passages would, of course, offer evidence for Hatzfeld's bipartite theory of the composition of the *Hellenica*. Hatzfeld's rejection of this evidence is a good indication of its weakness, and of the discriminating impartiality with which he has studied the whole problem of the composition of the *Hellenica*.

Not a few scholars have maintained that a division should be made at the end of book II, and not after II, 3, 10. Their arguments must be examined.

Hell. VI, 4, 37 mentions the assassination of Alexander of Pherae. This occurred in 358.⁵⁰ The *Hellenica*, therefore, was not finished until after this date. With this fact in mind, Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, 195, calls attention to the last words of book II. Describing the reconciliation of the Athenian oligarchs and democrats in 401, Xenophon says: "And after swearing that in very truth they would not bear resentment, they have lived together as citizens to this day, and the democracy has remained loyal to its pledge" (II, 4, 43). Niebuhr claims that these words would have no point if written many years after the reconciliation; that they must have been written long before 358. And so he argues for a division of the *Hellenica* into two parts at the end of book II. Niebuhr's contention for the early dating of II, 4, 43 has been successfully overthrown by Sauppe, *op. cit.*, 307-08, and Hatzfeld, *op. cit.*, 120-22.

⁵⁰ Cf. Nitsche, *Ueber die Abfass. von Xen. Hell.* (1871), 15 ff.

De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, 11 ff., likewise places the break at the end of the second book. His argument is that the second and third books do not join well. Book II ends with the reconciliation of 401/400 at Athens (*cf.* Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 40, 4 for the date). Book III begins thus: "So ended the civil strife at Athens. *After this* Cyrus sent messengers to Lacedaemon asking the Lacedaemonians to help him, since he had helped them in the war against the Athenians." This embassy cannot have been sent later than 402/01, for it was in the spring of 401 that the expedition of Cyrus actually got under way. "After this", therefore, is a blunder. And so De Sanctis maintains that books II and III were not written continuously; that some time intervened between the writing of these two books; that Xenophon's chronological error points to a careless joining together of two originally separate parts.⁵¹ With this we may take issue. On the supposition that the beginning of book III was written immediately after the end of book II, we can understand the anachronism if with Hatzfeld we suppose, what we have no reason to doubt, that these words were written a good many years after 401. Obviously the civil war at Athens, regarded as one group of events, antedates the expedition of Cyrus, considered as a whole. We can readily see how a none too careful author like Xenophon, writing some time after these occurrences, when his memory of the details was uncertain, might not have stopped to ascertain whether the very last events of the former story preceded or followed certain preliminaries to the latter story. This slight overlapping, probably a matter of a twelvemonth or less, is not a serious matter for Xenophon to have overlooked. Compared with some of the baffling chronological problems raised by the text of book I, this anachronism is a mere trifle. Furthermore, we have reason to believe, on stylistic grounds, that the beginning of book III was written at the same time as the ending of book II. Consider the form of the first sentence in book III, ἡ μὲν δὴ Ἀθήνησι στάσις οὕτως ἐτελεύτησεν. This sentence is a perfect example of the type that Xenophon so often uses at the conclusion of a narrative to sum it up and round it off. In our preceding discussion of these

⁵¹ De Sanctis believes that books I-II were written after, not before, III-V, 1, 36. For a discussion of this, see below, pp. 259-261.

sentences fifty examples in the *Hellenica* were enumerated. The first sentence in book III is thus definitely indicated as being closely connected with the narrative at the end of book II. It does not, then, seem possible to agree with De Sanctis that on account of this anachronism a division of the *Hellenica* should be made at the end of book II.

De Sanctis feels that he must offer some explanation for the fact that stylistic changes seem to begin after II, 3, 10 and not after II, 4, 43. He suggests that the monotonous character of the narrative and the scarcity of particles in I-II, 3, 10 are the result of Xenophon's writing in the annalistic style. The changes in these respects that begin after II, 3, 10 betoken Xenophon's liberation from the annalistic method, and his greater interest in his subject. So argues De Sanctis. It is very hard to believe that an annalistic method of narrating events leads, *per se*, to monotony, or that it tends to reduce the number of particles appearing in the narrative. It does seem that if Xenophon had wished, he could have used *μήν*, for example, in the earlier annalistic narrative just as freely as he did in the later part of the *Hellenica*.

The next question to consider is the possibility of dividing the *Hellenica* at V, 1, 36. There are certain passages in *Hell.* B and C which, the claim is made, must have been written some time before 358, the earliest date for the composition of VI, 4, 37. For this reason, scholars have argued for a point of division before VI, 4, 37, and have generally located it at V, 1, 36. Now the reasons for assigning a date long in advance of 358 do not seem convincing in the case of any of these passages. First let us consider IV, 3, 16. Here Xenophon says of the battle of Coronea (394) that it was "like no other battle of our day." Grosser⁵² believes that such a statement would not have been written after Mantinea (362) or Leuctra (371). Hatzfeld, *op. cit.*, 122-23, argues with some plausibility against Grosser, and De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, 7, argues with less success against Hatzfeld. To the present writer it would not seem surprising if Xenophon should write, after 362, a rather rhetorical exaggeration of the importance of Coronea, for this battle was one of the great exploits of Xenophon's hero Agesilaus. Be this as it may, there

⁵² *Fleckeis. Jahrb.* 95 (1867), 743.

is one fact which does seem to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that Xenophon could have written IV, 3, 16 after Mantinea. In the *Agésilau*s (II, 9), Xenophon describes the battle of Coronea in just the same terms. If Xenophon could so characterize this battle in the *Agésilau*s, written of course after Agésilau's death and therefore after Mantinea, how can it be argued that the same statement in the *Hellenica* must have been written before Mantinea? ⁵³ The upshot of the matter is that IV, 3, 16 could have been written before, during, or after the battle of Mantinea, equally well, and that there is no reason here to look for a break in the composition of the *Hellenica* between IV, 3, 16 and VI, 4, 37.

Next we must examine IV, 4, 15. Nitsche, *op. cit.*, 5-6, believes that a *terminus ante quem* can be found for the dating of this passage. Here Xenophon praises the Lacedaemonians for their moderation in refusing to compel the Phliasians to restore their pro-Lacedaemonian exiles in 392. Nitsche holds that Xenophon would not have written this commendation after the occurrence of such Lacedaemonian outrages as the overthrow of the Phliasian government in 379 (V, 3, 25), and the seizure of the Cadmeia in 383 (V, 2, 25 ff.). This contention seems very uncertain. There is no reason why Xenophon, writing at a time when his eyes were opened to the ruthless self-interest of contemporary Lacedaemonian policy, could not have praised an earlier action which seemed to him admirably disinterested.

⁵³ De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, 6, believes that in the *Agésilau*s, Xenophon did not write καὶ γὰρ ἐγένετο οἷα περ οὐκ ἄλλη τῶν γ' ἐφ' ἡμῶν for the same reason that he wrote the similar statement in the *Hellenica*. In the *Agésilau*s, according to De Sanctis, the words are written in order to justify the preceding διηγῆσθαι which seems out of place inasmuch as a laudatory paragraph (not in the *Hellenica*) has been inserted between the enumeration of the forces and the account of the battle itself. (In the *Hellenica* the account of the battle follows, logically enough, directly after the enumeration of forces.) Now the fact remains that, whatever the motive may have been, Xenophon did say of Coronea in the *Agésilau*s ἐγένετο οἷα περ οὐκ ἄλλη, κτλ., and after all this is the main point.

Nitsche, *op. cit.*, 5, too, believes that IV, 3, 16 must have been written before Mantinea. When confronted by the same statement in the *Agésilau*s, Nitsche takes refuge in the theory that the historical part, at least, of the *Agésilau*s was not written by Xenophon.

Could he not give the devil his due to this extent? This passage can hardly be said to offer any reliable evidence as to the date of its composition.

Two passages which are often invoked as an argument for separating *Hell. B* from *Hell. C* are III, 5, 25 and V, 2, 3.⁵⁴ In III, 5, 25 where the events of 395 are being described, Xenophon mentions in anticipation the death of Pausanias, which as a matter of fact did not occur until 381 at least.⁵⁵ In V, 2, 3 Pausanias is mentioned again as participating in the events of 385. It is considered strange that Xenophon should usher Pausanias off the stage in III, 5, 25, only to bring him back again in V, 2, 3; and the explanation is given that when III, 5, 25 was written Xenophon planned to carry his history only as far as the Peace of Antalcidas (V, 1, 36), and so the death of Pausanias, coming after this date, had to be mentioned in advance, in III, 5, 25. As evidence for a break at V, 1, 36 these speculations are not convincing. They do not make adequate allowance for Xenophon's carelessness in composition. If, for example, Xenophon can mention the unIntroduced Chares (VII, 2, 18) as a familiar figure,⁵⁶ there can be no great significance in his bringing Pausanias back on the scene after the final farewell. Xenophon, if he intended to continue his history beyond the date of Pausanias' death, certainly could have chronicled this event in III, 5, 25 without pausing to ask himself whether he would have later occasion for an incidental allusion to Pausanias. To deny that Xenophon could have so written III, 5, 25 is to ascribe to him a far more systematic scrupulousness than his work in the *Hellenica* reveals.

There is still another argument for making a division of the *Hellenica* at V, 1, 36 that remains to be considered. Inconsistency in Xenophon's treatment of the character of Agesipolis is found by Nitsche, *op. cit.*, 6-7, who asserts that Agesipolis is ridiculed in IV, 7, 2-7, but praised in V, 3, 9 and V, 3, 20. This does not seem a strong argument for dividing the *Hellenica* at V, 1, 36. The high calibre of Agesipolis' army, emphasized in

⁵⁴ Cf. Nitsche, *op. cit.*, 5-6.

⁵⁵ Cf. Hatzfeld, *op. cit.*, 120.

⁵⁶ For a list of oversights of a similar nature in the *Hellenica*, cf. Underhill, *op. cit.*, XVI ff., XXXI ff.

V, 3, 9, is as much an indication of Spartan respect for Olynthian prowess as it is a tribute to Agesipolis' personal qualities of leadership; and furthermore Xenophon suggests that it was the official position of Agesipolis rather than his personality that attracted these fine soldiers. And in V, 3, 20 Xenophon is merely paying gracious respect to the memory of Agesipolis in connection with the account of his death. So much, then, for the attempts to divide the *Hellenica* at V, 1, 36.

A question that has been much discussed is the relative order of composition of the *Hellenica* and the *Agésilas*. From the numerous common passages in the two works, some scholars have concluded that the *Hellenica* was written first and was drawn upon by Xenophon when he wrote the *Agésilas*. Others, however, believe that the *Agésilas* was written first, and that Xenophon in the *Hellenica* borrowed extensively from it. The weight of the evidence would seem to favor the supposition that the *Hellenica* is the earlier work. Careful studies of this problem have been made by W. Seyffert,⁵⁷ and A. Opitz.⁵⁸ They find that a great many words of the *Hellenica* are changed slightly in the *Agésilas*, and that these changes make for a greater finish and elegance. It is hard to escape the conclusion of Seyffert and Opitz that the *Hellenica* was written first, and that material derived from it was given further polish and refinement for use in the rhetorical encomium. In all probability the *Hellenica*, at least as far as V, 4, 49 (or § 38?), the latest passage that has a parallel in the *Agésilas*, was composed before the *Agésilas* was written.

This is not the unanimous opinion of scholars, however. According to De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, 1-11, some of the evidence suggests that the *Hellenica* preceded the *Agésilas*, while there are other indications that the *Agésilas* came first. To explain this apparent paradox De Sanctis offers the theory that Xenophon in writing the *Agésilas* had before him an unedited first draft of the *Hellenica* (extending at least as far as V, 4, 49), and that after the *Agésilas* was completed, Xenophon resumed work on the *Hellenica* and retouched some parts of it that were already written. On the strength of this theory, De Sanctis, *op. cit.*,

⁵⁷ *De Xen. Ages. Quaest.* (1909).

⁵⁸ *Quaestiones Xenophontaeae: De Hell. atque Ages. necessitudine* (1912).

15 ff., proceeds to belittle the force of the stylistic arguments for a division of the *Hellenica* at II, 3, 10. Believing that our *Hellenica* is not Xenophon's first draft, De Sanctis argues that later retouchings will account for such changes as the use of ἀκολουθεῖν instead of ἐπεσθαι in the last part of the *Hellenica*. In the opinion of De Sanctis we cannot tell from our text just what the first draft was like, and so statistics gathered from our present text are likely to be altogether misleading.

Let us examine the evidence which De Sanctis cites as indicating that the *Agesilaus* preceded the *Hellenica*. While the majority of the parallel passages, in De Sanctis' opinion, tend to prove the priority of the *Hellenica*, there are two passages which indicate to him that the *Agesilaus* is the earlier work. In *Ages.* I, 28, Xenophon says προεῖπε δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τοῖς στρατιώταις, ὡς εὐθὺς ἡγήσοιτο τὴν συντομωτάτην ἐπὶ τὰ κράτιστα τῆς χώρας, ὅπως αὐτόθεν αὐτῷ τὰ σώματα καὶ τὴν γνώμην παρασκευάζονται ὡς ἀγωνιούμενοι. In *Hell.* III, 4, 20 we have προεῖπεν αὐτοῖς ὡς εὐθὺς ἡγήσοιτο τὴν συντομωτάτην ἐπὶ τὰ κράτιστα τῆς χώρας, ὅπως αὐτόθεν οὕτω τὰ σώματα καὶ τὴν γνώμην παρασκευάζονται ὡς ἀγωνιούμενοι, but before these words Xenophon has spoken of thirty Spartiatae (unmentioned in the *Agesilaus*) who have just arrived from Greece to serve as generals in Agesilaus' army. Consequently Agesilaus' words in the *Hellenica* seem to be addressed to these thirty officers (αὐτοῖς), and not to the soldiers, as in the *Agesilaus*. De Sanctis argues that the version of the *Agesilaus* is correct and earlier, and that the mention of the thirty generals is a careless addition which destroys the logic of the passage. He offers two arguments to support his belief that the account given in the *Agesilaus* is the correct one: 1) Tissaphernes learned that Agesilaus had announced his intention of advancing by the most direct route (i. e., toward Sardis) into hostile territory (cf. *Hell.* III, 4, 21); this proves that the plans of Agesilaus were discussed before the whole army, for the news would not have reached Tissaphernes had the announcement been made only at a small council of officers; 2) Agesilaus could have told the *soldiers*, but not the newly-arrived *officers*, to hold their minds and bodies in readiness for the coming campaign. For these two reasons De Sanctis concludes that the mention in the *Hellenica* of the thirty generals is a later addition, thoughtlessly worked into the already existing narrative of the *Agesilaus*. As regards De

Sanctis' first argument, we may reasonably doubt, after reading *Anab.* VII, 1, 13-14 whether a group of officers could prevent the soldiers from learning about matters discussed in council. Furthermore, we may be sure that Agesilaus took good care to see that Tissaphernes heard of this intended march toward Sardis. In III, 4, 11 ff. we are told how Agesilaus crossed Tissaphernes by allowing false information to reach him. Here Tissaphernes, taking indications of an impending raid on Caria at their face value, protected Caria, while Agesilaus made instead a successful surprise attack on Phrygia. Now in III, 4, 20 ff. Agesilaus double-crossed Tissaphernes by proceeding toward Sardis in accordance with his avowed intentions, while Tissaphernes, refusing to be crossed a second time, waited in Caria to meet Agesilaus. It was part of Agesilaus' well-conceived strategy that this true information should reach Tissaphernes. Accordingly we are not disposed to agree with De Sanctis in his belief that Tissaphernes' knowledge of Agesilaus' plans proves that these plans were announced to the whole army.⁵⁹ In reply to De Sanctis' second argument, we may point out that his understanding of the clause *ὅπως αὐτόθεν οὕτω τὰ σώματα καὶ τὴν γνώμην παρασκευάζουσιν ὡς ἀγωνιούμενοι* is open to question. We need not suppose that Xenophon actually told officers (or men) to hold their bodies and minds in readiness. Is it not rather that he simply announced to them that he was going to lead them against the enemy by the shortest possible route; and that his *object* in telling them this was to get their bodies and minds prepared? Compare Brownson's translation, "He announced to them that he would immediately lead them by the shortest route to the best parts of the country, his object being to have them begin at once to prepare their bodies and spirits for the fray." Realizing that the officers have just come from the peace and quiet of Sparta, Agesilaus wishes to get them as quickly as possible into good physical and mental condition for active campaigning. To this end (*cf.* *ὅπως*) he tells them that he is going to lead them into the enemy's country by the shortest possible route. Could not this have been said to the generals? As far as the evidence of these passages is concerned, we are not com-

⁵⁹ In all probability the announcement *was* made to the soldiers, as Xenophon says in the *Agesilaus*. But Tissaphernes' knowledge of the plan has no bearing on the matter.

pelled to believe that the *Agésilas* antedates the *Hellenica*. There is no inconsistency between the two accounts, and no improbability in either one of them. All we need suppose is that these orders were issued from headquarters through ordinary channels to officers and men alike.

De Sanctis offers further evidence which indicates, in his opinion, that the *Hellenica* was written after the *Agésilas*. In several instances where ἀκολουθεῖν and περί occur in the *Hellenica*, the corresponding passages in the *Agésilas* have ἔπεισθαι and ἀμφί. It is not necessary to agree with De Sanctis that these changes indicate the priority of the *Agésilas*. On the supposition that the *Hellenica* was written first we can explain these words in the *Agésilas* by appealing to certain stylistic considerations which seem to have influenced Xenophon in the composition of the rhetorical encomium. Opitz, *op. cit.*, definitely establishes that Xenophon tends to avoid, in the *Agésilas*, an ordinary prosaic word, and to prefer a rare or poetic synonym; that he seeks to maintain a certain uniformity in his choice of words; and that he strives for rhetorical effect by the lavish introduction of figures such as homoeoteleuton. These considerations will adequately explain the changes mentioned by De Sanctis. See Opitz, *op. cit.*, especially pp. 17 ff., 27 ff., 32 ff.

It seems, then, that the evidence offered by De Sanctis for the *Agésilas'* priority to the *Hellenica* is not convincing. There is, therefore, no conflict of evidence in this connection which requires for its explanation the assumption of wholesale retouchings in a first draft of the *Hellenica*. And so the doubts of De Sanctis (based on this assumption) as to the validity of the statistical method as applied to the *Hellenica* need not disturb us.

Agésilas probably died in the winter of 361/60. In all likelihood Xenophon's encomium, being a genuinely heartfelt tribute, was not long delayed. Its composition, then, would seem to have interrupted Xenophon's work on the *Hellenica* at some point between V, 4, 49 (the latest passage of the *Hellenica* used in the *Agésilas*) and VI, 4, 37 (written no earlier than 358).⁶⁰

We must discuss one more attempt which has been made to date the *Hellenica's* composition. In *Hell.* I, 7, 15 we are told how Socrates, as *prytanis*, objected to the illegal proposition to

⁶⁰ Cf. Schmid-Stählin, *op. cit.*, 506, n. 1.

try the generals of Arginusae in a body; in I, 7, 34 the number of generals condemned is given as eight; in I, 7, 1-2 the names of the eight are listed, and it is related that two of them did not come to Athens to stand trial. This, according to Rapaport, *op. cit.*, contradicts in two respects the account of these proceedings found in the *Memorabilia*, where the number of generals is given as nine (*Mem.* I, 1, 18), and where Socrates is described not as a *prytanis* but as the *ἐπιστάτης* (*Mem.* I, 1, 18; IV, 4, 2). In Rapaport's opinion, Socrates cannot have been the *ἐπιστάτης*, for if he were, how could the proposal have been put to a vote without his consent? Rapaport concludes that the version of the *Memorabilia* is inaccurate and earlier, and that Xenophon had not yet begun to write or to collect material for the *Hellenica* when he composed the *Memorabilia*, else the errors in the *Memorabilia* would have been corrected. Since Rapaport believes that the date of the *Memorabilia* is 365 or later, he agrees with Schwartz that the whole *Hellenica* must have been written at one time near the end of Xenophon's life. Rapaport supposes that Plato, in *Apol.* 32 B, is the source for the erroneous account that Xenophon gives in the *Memorabilia*. This point does not seem well taken. For Plato here describes Socrates as *prytanis*, and says that ten generals were tried.⁶¹ Thus we see that this alleged source deviates from the *Memorabilia* in just the same two respects that the *Hellenica* does. If, as Rapaport claims, discrepancies between the *Memorabilia* and the *Hellenica* prove that the *Memorabilia* was written first, then it would seem that the similar discrepancies between the *Memorabilia* and the *Apology* should preclude the possibility that Xenophon here used Plato as his source. Regarding the accuracy of the account in the *Memorabilia*, we may well question Rapaport's assumption that no proposal could be brought to a vote in the ecclesia over the objection of the *ἐπιστάτης*. Rapaport himself acknowledges that this is a pure assumption; he is able to cite no evidence in direct support of it; and he admits that he has no detailed knowledge of the powers that the *ἐπιστάτης* possessed at this time. And furthermore, it is clear that there is really no contradiction at all between the accounts where Socrates is described as *prytanis*, and those where he is described as *ἐπιστάτης*. For of course the *ἐπιστάτης* was one of the

⁶¹ Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 34, repeating Plato's error, gives the number as ten.

prytanes; and in Thuc. VI, 14 the ἐπιστάτης (in the year 415) is actually addressed by a speaker, ὃ πρύτανι. Since, then, the term *prytanis* could be applied to the ἐπιστάτης and since we do not know what control the ἐπιστάτης had over an unruly ecclesia and a thoroughly cowed body of prytanes, we are at liberty to assume that Socrates actually was the ἐπιστάτης. And so one of Rapaport's alleged discrepancies between the *Memorabilia* and the *Hellenica* would seem to be non-existent. With regard to the number of generals, we may have confidence in the circumstantial account of the *Hellenica*. The number nine in our text of the *Memorabilia* may possibly be explained as a scribal error, arising from the similarity in sound between "eta" and "theta". But it seems more likely that Xenophon himself is responsible for the error in the *Memorabilia*, and that his mistake comes from his careless use of his own words in *Hell.* I, 7, 1, "Now the people at home deposed the above-mentioned generals, with the exception of Conon" (Brownson), οἱ δ' ἐν οἴκῳ τούτους μὲν τοὺς στρατηγούς ἔπαυσαν πλὴν Κόνωνος. We may suppose that Xenophon, writing the *Memorabilia* long after these events took place, turned to this passage in the *Hellenica* to refresh his recollection of the details. He read the sentence just quoted, and he took τούτους τοὺς στρατηγούς to refer to the full board of ten generals recently enumerated in I, 5, 16.⁶² He would have found in the *Hellenica* no mention of the death of Archestratus, one of the ten generals listed in I, 5, 16 (this event, overlooked by Xenophon, is mentioned in Lys. XXI, 8). Subtracting only Conon's name (cf. πλὴν Κόνωνος), Xenophon calculated that nine must have been the number deposed, and so he imagined that nine was the number actually condemned. Had he read a little farther into *Hell.* I, 7 he would have found the list of eight names given, but he carelessly neglected to do so. These passages, then, indicate that *Hell.* A is earlier and not later than the *Memorabilia*, a conclusion that would invalidate Rapaport's argument for the unitarian position.

From these same passages Valeton,⁶³ a non-unitarian, also concludes that the account in the *Memorabilia* was written prior to the version of the *Hellenica*. He argues from this that the

⁶² Has a new year intervened between I, 5, 16 and I, 7, 1? See Ferguson in *C. A. H.* V, 484, but cf. *Hell.* I, 6, 1.

⁶³ *Sertum Nabericum* (1908), 387-402.

first two books of the *Hellenica* must have been written later than the third book, with the *Memorabilia* intervening. But since the arguments for the *Memorabilia's* priority to *Hell. I*, 7 are unconvincing, we are not compelled to accept Valetton's theory of the late composition of *Hell. I-II*.

This theory, by the way, has found several adherents in recent years. De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, 15 states that to the best of his knowledge, no one has raised a question as to the relative order of composition of the first section (*i. e.*, books I-II) and the succeeding section. He has apparently overlooked the work of Valetton, *op. cit.*, Richter,⁶⁴ Pohlenz, *loc. cit.*, Schmid-Stählin, *op. cit.*, 504, and Fräulein Vorrenhagen, *op. cit.*, 7-8, 140, all of whom raise this question and favor the theory that the first part of the *Hellenica* was written after, and not before, the second part. In support of this theory De Sanctis argues that in *Hell. III*, 1, 4 Xenophon shows anti-democratic prejudice in telling how the democracy sent to Thibron 300 oligarchic knights, in the hope that this force would not come back alive. This, as De Sanctis would have it, is in marked contrast with the tribute Xenophon pays at the end of book II to the forbearance of the restored democracy. De Sanctis believes that III, 1, 4 must be dated in the early period of Xenophon's banishment, and that II, 4, 40-43 must have been written at a later time, when Xenophon had hopes of a reconciliation with Athens. This conclusion of De Sanctis seems questionable. What right have we to assume that Xenophon as a historian would call attention to undeniably admirable conduct of his political opponents only at a time when he had expectation of getting something in return?⁶⁵ And let us consider the alleged anti-democratic prejudice of III, 1, 4. The action of the democrats in sending the oligarchic knights to Asia was so pointed, that Xenophon's citation of the motive is all but superfluous. If the democrats did so act, in spite of their promises to bear no malice,

⁶⁴ *Op. cit.*, cf. above, n. 32.

⁶⁵ Xenophon, certain prejudices notwithstanding, seems to have been an essentially fair-minded man. He shows much willingness to give credit where credit is due. After praising, in VII, 5, 16, the Athenians for helping Mantinea against Thebes, he writes in 19 ff. a genuine appreciation of the soldierly qualities of Epaminondas. And all his friendship for Sparta does not prevent him from condemning most emphatically her actions after 387/6.

this lapse could be forgiven them, for the provocation was great. It would not take a violent oligarchic partisan to call attention to this altogether pardonable manifestation of human nature. If Xenophon could censure as he does the outrages committed after the peace of Antalcidas by his friends the Spartans, surely he could have written this mild criticism of the Athenian democrats at a time, late in his life, when friendly relations had once more been established. The belief of De Sanctis that III, 1, 4 antedates the end of book II rests on very slender foundations.

There seems to be no strong positive evidence for the later composition of the first part of the *Hellenica*. On the negative side, this theory does violence to the natural, orderly picture of the development of Xenophon's style. It would compel us to suppose that Xenophon, after his individual style had been fully developed in the *Anabasis* and in *Hell. B*, deliberately abandoned his own methods of writing, and made in *Hell. A* an attempt to reproduce the style of Thucydides, because here he was completing the unfinished work of his predecessor. Only thus can Fräulein Vorrenhagen explain the many resemblances in style that *Hell. A* bears to the history of Thucydides.⁶⁶ Assuming, with her, the tripartite theory of composition, can we imagine Xenophon laying aside his pen after II, 3, 10 with a sigh of relief, as much as to say, before proceeding with *Hell. C*, "Thank heaven that's over; now I can be myself again"? The stylistic resemblances to Thucydides' book are so much more reasonably explained if *Hell. A* is an early and comparatively immature work, for in this case Thucydidean influence is a perfectly natural thing, with nothing forced or artificial about it whatsoever.

It is questioned by Blake⁶⁷ whether the statistics regarding $\mu\eta\nu$ really warrant the assumption of a division at II, 3, 10. Blake maintains, in effect, that the statisticians, in all consistency, should assign an early date to passages after II, 3, 10 devoid of $\mu\eta\nu$. This reasoning does not appear sound. Only after II, 3, 10 does $\mu\eta\nu$ become an ordinary feature of Xenophon's style in the *Hellenica*. All at once Xenophon breaks the

⁶⁶ *Op. cit.*, 7-8. Fräulein Vorrenhagen, be it said, is not dogmatic in her belief that *Hell. A* was composed after *Hell. B*. She regards this theory with favor, but she does not consider it as definitely established.

⁶⁷ *The Hellenica of Xenophon Books I and II* (1894), XXVI.

ice, as it were, and allows himself to use this particle. But once the ice has been broken, he need not be expected to use the word on every page. It can hardly be an accident that *μήν*, so common in the later books of the *Hellenica*, does not occur once in the ninety-three Teubner pages of the combined *Cynegeticus* and *Hell. A*. No comparable extent of text lacking *μήν* is to be found in the *Hellenica* after II, 3, 10; the longest stretch is III, 1, 7-III, 5, 7, i. e., twenty-eight pages (cf. Blake, *loc. cit.*). However, as far as the evidence of *μήν* alone is concerned, we should not be compelled to believe that much time intervened between the writing of *Hell. A* and the rest of the work. Xenophon could have abandoned a prejudice against *μήν* over night. But we can scarcely imagine that over one and the same night he also divested himself of his prejudices against *καί . . . δέ, ἄτε, ὥστε, αὖ, μέντοι*; that he became increasingly addicted to the use of *γέ* and *δή*, and of the future optative; that he developed a liking for *τρόπαιον ἱστασθαι, ἀκολουθεῖν, ἐκ τούτου*, and a corresponding distaste for *τρόπαιον ἱστάναι, ἔπεισθαι, μετὰ ταῦτα*; that he came to feel that it was proper for him to make use of the first person pronoun, and to display his sense of humor; that he acquired, withal, a lamentable tendency toward sententious utterance; that he became all at once a contriver of the most shrewdly subtle rhetorical arguments; that he assumed an interest in the personal characteristics of the people of his history; that he began to write in a totally different spirit, with a vividness and an attention to picturesque detail altogether new; that he developed certain other stylistic mannerisms which we have duly noted.

All things considered, then, the evidence seems to point to the theory of composition advocated by E. Müller and Hatzfeld. *Hell. I-II*, 3, 10 was, apparently, one of Xenophon's earliest works. The rest of the *Hellenica* was probably written after an interval of a good many years, during which period Xenophon's style was radically changed as a result of his work on the *Anabasis*. In all likelihood the composition of this part of the *Hellenica* was spread out over a considerable period of time, but we are not compelled to suppose that a division of the work occurs at V, 1, 36.

MALCOLM MACLAREN, JR.

ROLLINS COLLEGE,
WINTER PARK, FLORIDA.

NOTE ON THE DECREES OF KALLIAS.

The credit for first subjecting to minute and careful scrutiny the famous stone now in Paris which bears the Athenian financial decrees of Kallias belongs to Wade-Gery. His readings, published in 1931 in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, mark a new epoch in the interpretation of these documents.¹ I have no intention of entering upon a discussion of the date of these decrees, for I consider it proved that they both belong in the year 434/3 B. C., the first and not the last year of a Panathenaic period.² This is, in fact, the date which Wade-Gery now accepts (*J. H. S.*, LIII [1933], p. 135), in spite of his earlier open thesis for 422 B. C. or 418 B. C.

The new readings, however, deserve some comment because of the important bearing they have on the restoration of certain clauses on the badly damaged surface of Face B (*I. G.*, I², 92).³ In the winter of 1929 I had occasion to examine the stone in Paris. My observations at that time confirmed the new readings, which Wade-Gery had already communicated to me by letter. In particular, I was interested in the initial letters of Face B, line 20, where the restoration of the *Corpus* is [ἐκ | δὲ τῶν φόρον] κατατιθέναι —. Not only is the right vertical hasta of nu partly preserved before the word κατατιθέναι, but part of a vertical hasta is preserved also in the letter space before this nu, on the narrow ridge of marble which now extends from top to bottom along the left edge of the inscribed surface. Both these strokes are visible in the excellent photograph given by Wade-Gery in *J. H. S.*, LI (1931), plate III, and they are indicated by him in his facsimile drawing, *ibidem*, plate I. The restoration [ἐκ | δὲ τῶν φόρον] is not compatible with the letters on the stone and must be rejected. My first suggestion was to read [ἐς | δὲ τὴν πόλιν]. Wade-Gery accepted this in principle, though he preferred to omit the definite article τὴν (correctly, I believe) in order to secure the conventional formulaic phrase ἐς πόλιν. He was then able to assume that the last two letter spaces of line 19

¹ H. T. Wade-Gery, "The Financial Decrees of Kallias," *J. H. S.*, LI (1931), pp. 57-85 and Plates I-III.

² W. Kolbe, *Sitzb. Ak. Berlin*, 1933, pp. 154-176.

³ The lines of Face B (*I. G.*, I², 92) are numbered as in the transcript on pp. 273-274 below.

were left uninscribed, and to restore [καὶ ἐς πόλιν] at the beginning of line 20.⁴

This restoration is not really satisfactory, for if the subject treated in line 20 is sufficiently different from that which precedes to justify a new paragraph (with two uninscribed letter spaces at the end of line 19), then the particle δέ, not the connective καί, is required at the beginning of line 20.⁵ We should read [ἐς δὲ πόλιν], just as line 26 begins with [ἡσπόσα δὲ τῷ] χρεμάτων. But the words [ἐς δὲ πόλιν] do not meet the requirements of space at the beginning of line 20. Kolbe finds it impossible to reconcile any form of the expression ἐς πόλιν with the verb κατατιθέναι which is preserved on the stone. This argument against ἐς πόλιν seems to me too fine-drawn. Where ἐς πόλιν means "on the acropolis" and κατατιθέναι means "to deposit," I see no inherent objection to combining the two phrases to mean "to deposit on the acropolis." But this is beside the point; the real objection to [ἐς δὲ πόλιν] is that the restoration is too short by one letter. Kolbe has suggested the reading [τὸ δὲ λοιπό]ν.

This restoration has the requisite number of letters to fill out the beginning of line 20, but it is subject to the same fatal objection as the [ἐκ | δὲ τῶν φόρο]ν of Kirchhoff's day: the penultimate letter of the phrase cannot be O; it must instead be I.

But Kolbe has argued that O is still possible, and that there can be no epigraphical objection either to his [τὸ δὲ λοιπό]ν or to Kirchhoff's [ἐκ | δὲ τῶν φόρο]ν. After studying the stone in Paris he was convinced that the stroke which Wade-Gery and I have read as iota is not an intentional stroke of any letter, but that the surface of the stone at the point in question has been lost to a depth of more than 1 mm. (the depth of the strokes of the letters). Klaffenbach and Nesselhauf examined the squeeze in the Berlin Academy, and reported that the vertical stroke—so far as they could tell—might or might not be part of a letter.⁶

I read these determinations made by Kolbe with great surprise. His published report reached me in Athens in the spring of 1933; and in June of the same year I again made a careful

⁴ Cf. Wade-Gery, *J. H. S.*, LI (1931), pp. 61-63 and notes 20, 21.

⁵ Cf. Kolbe, *Sitzb. Ak. Berlin*, 1933, p. 163.

⁶ Kolbe, *Sitzb. Ak. Berlin*, 1933, p. 163.

examination of the stone in Paris. The vertical stroke which Kolbe rejects is clearly an intentional stroke. M. Charbonneaux kindly consented to examine the stone with me, and was good enough to allow me to quote him as saying that the stroke was perfectly clear to him. He did not wish, however, to commit himself to the identification of the letter as iota. I must disagree with Kolbe on yet another score. He states that the surface along both edges of Face B has been chiselled away in Christian times, and that the depth of the chiselling amounts to "at least more than 1 mm." At the point where this stroke occurs, the

loss of surface is less than one-half of one millimetre. Wade-Gery found that there was "not room for a hair" between the surface at this point and his straight-edge laid across the stone.⁷ My determination, made with a straight-edge, agrees with his; when measured from the original surface level (determined by the straight-edge) the depth of this cutting of iota is the same as the depth of the other letters in the inscription.

But this is not all. There are strokes of other letters on this left marginal band, which I am now able to record for the first time (Fig. 1). They are no more accidental than the stroke of iota, and indeed fall into place in the known restorations of lines 19-27. We should read in line 19, [α]ῖροῖς; in line 20, [---]ν; in line 22, τ[ῶ]ν; and in line



FIG. 1

27, ἡ[ο]ι. It is particularly gratifying to find confirmation on the stone for Wade-Gery's important restoration ἡ[ο]ι in line 27.

⁷ Wade-Gery, *J. H. S.*, LI (1931), p. 61, note 20.

These strokes may all be discerned on the photograph presented by Wade-Gery in *J. H. S.*, LI (1931), plate III.

The only difficulty about reading the first two preserved letters in line 20 as [----]ιϛ is that the iota is not properly centred (cf. Wade-Gery, *op. cit.*, p. 62). But after all, this is no real difficulty; the letter iota was by no means always centred beneath the letter above it, and very good examples of misplacement toward the left (such as we find in line 20) are clear on this same document in [χρέμ]ασιν (line 18) and in ἡ[ο]ι νῦν (line 27). Whatever the restoration of line 20, it is clear that [τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν] and [ἐκ | δὲ τῶν φόρων] are epigraphically impossible. This discussion, though it deals with the determination of only one letter, is important because any evidence that is connected with what the hellenotamiai were to do with their funds in 434 is a matter of supreme concern. We shall return to this point later.

Other readings deserve some comment. In line 9, before the alpha, more than half of mu is preserved. The reading is [----]μα τὸν ἀρχιτέκ[τονα ----]. In the same line the reading τῶμ Προ[πυλαίων ----] is probable. The traces on the stone favor mu, and not nu, in the word τῶμ; two central strokes may be discerned, which by themselves alone look like part of the letter upsilon. In line 14, Wade-Gery has already read the iota of μν[ρ]ί[ας]; directly above it is the alpha of χρῆσ[θ]α[ι].

In line 6, the restoration of the *Corpus* is [γεγ]ραμμένα. Kolbe (*Sitzb. Ak. Berlin*, 1933, pp. 175-176) repeats this reading, though Wade-Gery read the second preserved letter as gamma, not alpha. My own inspection of the stone in 1933 confirms that of Wade-Gery. The two sloping side-bars are clear, but the apex of the letter is lost. Enough of the surface of the stone between the side-bars is preserved to show that, if the cross-bar of alpha ever existed there, it must have been cut very shallow (so as now to be entirely lost by weathering) or else very high within the apex. Purely epigraphical considerations, in my opinion, demand the reading [----]ργμμένα. This has also the advantage of being correct in form orthographically. Those who prefer [γεγ]ραμμένα not only make a questionable reading of the first alpha, but assume that the word was misspelled. I do not believe the matter is susceptible of strictly formal proof one way or

the other. But if a satisfactory restoration is possible with the letter gamma instead of alpha, then that reading would seem to me preferable. Wade-Gery's suggestion [ἡορίσαι πλὲν μὲ τὰ ἔχσε]ργγμένα meets the necessary requirements, though I should prefer καὶ τὸν ἀκρόπολιν [ὀρίζεν πλὲν | ἔ μὲ τὰ ἔχσε]ργγμένα for the sake of the probable restoration [ὀρισ]θεῖ instead of [ποιε]θεῖ in line 7. The present reading of lines 5-7 is certainly troublesome. Obviously something is to be done to the acropolis; exactly what this something is must be read in the two verbs which were inscribed at the end of line 5 and in line 6. The second verb is ἐπι[σκευά]ζεν, which is repeated in line 7 as ἐπισκευα[σθεῖ]. The first verb has been lost from the stone, but the precise diction of epigraphic style requires that it be the present (?) infinitive of [----]θεῖ which appears also in line 7. The old restoration [μετακοσμεῖν] (*I. G.*, I², 92) is out of the question, because [μετακοσμε]θεῖ cannot be supplied in line 7. Similarly, the verb [ποιε]θεῖ in line 7 cannot be correct, because the restoration [ποιεῖν] in line 5 would be meaningless. No one was to "make" the acropolis; in fact, whatever the verb to be supplied in line 5 and whether or not our argument from epigraphic style is valid that it should be the same as the verb in line 7, the restoration [ποιε]θεῖ of line 7 is unsatisfactory because its subject must, in all reason, be *ἡ ἀκρόπολις*. This is the logical interpretation of the sentence, and [ποιε]θεῖ can be retained only by the very loose assumption that some such idea as "work on the acropolis" is to be inferred from the words τὴν ἀκρόπολιν above. The mental agility required in making this shift is then called into play again with ἐπισκευα[σθεῖ], where the subject is obviously *ἡ ἀκρόπολις*, just as τὸν ἀκρόπολιν is the object of ἐπι[σκευά]ζεν in line 6. There seems to me no escape from the conclusion that the word to be restored in line 5 must be a form of the verb [....]θεῖ in line 7, and I restore:

---- καὶ τὸν ἀκρόπολιν [ὀρίζεν πλὲν]

[ἔ μὲ τὰ ἔχσε]ργγμένα καὶ ἐπι[σκευά]ζεν δέκα τάλαντα ἀ[ναλίσκοντα]
[ς τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ] ἡ ἐκάστο ἡέος [ἀν ὀρισ]θεῖ καὶ ἐπισκευα[σθεῖ ὅς κάλλ]
[ιστα· ----]

Following this clause of the decree come the provisions for collaboration of the tamiai and the architect in overseeing the work and for the preparation of the plan by the architect who

designed the Propylaia. Kolbe's reading [- τὸ δὲ γράμμ]α in line 9 is confirmed by the existence on the stone of the last mu in γράμμα. The restoration should be:

[.τὸ δὲ γράμ]μα τὸν ἀρχιτέκ[τονα ποι]ῆν [ὃ]σπερ τῷ Προ[πυλαίων· -]

The use of the verbs ὀρίζεν and ἐπισκευάζεν in lines 5-7 is further confirmed by the readings now possible in lines 9-12, where again *ἡ ἀκρ[όπολις]* appears as the subject of *[ὀρισθ]έσεται* and *ἐπισκευασθ[έ]σεται*. The lines should be restored as follows:

[--- -- -- -- --] *ἡοῦ*
[τὸς δὲ ἐπιμ]ελέσ[θο] μετὰ τῷ[ν ἐπιστ]ατῶν *ἡόπος* ἀριστ[α καὶ ἀκριβέ]
[στατα ὀρισθ]έσεται *ἡ ἀκρ[όπολις]* καὶ ἐπισκευασθ[έ]σεται τὰ δεό]
[μενα· --- -- --]

It is a noteworthy fact that the provision for work to be done is followed by the designation of the responsible party to see to it that the work is done correctly. The fixing of boundaries and the making of repairs on the acropolis was to be under the supervision of the architect and the epistatai. As may be inferred from line 12, the money to be spent was Athena's money. Now, one expects the same designation of responsible parties after the provision for work on the sculptures of the Parthenon, the Golden Nikai, and the Propylaia. They should of course be the epistatai, of whose existence we know, for the Parthenon and Propylaia at least, from the building accounts. These epistatai were naturally interested in the general plan for improvement of the acropolis, and for this reason they were made jointly responsible with the architect (Mnesikles) for that plan (*μετὰ τῷ[ν ἐπιστ]ατῶν* in line 10). But the treasurers of Athena were also concerned, for the money was to be furnished by them; so they too were made joint overseers of the undertaking (*[χρουνε]πιστατόντ[ο]ν* in line 8). In order to justify the compound verb in line 8 and the reference to epistatai in line 10, the restoration at the end of line 4 and the beginning of line 5 should, in my opinion, be *ἄπ[αντας τὸς ἐπι]στατόντας* κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφί[σμένα]. The designation of these epistatai as responsible parties requires also in lines 3-4 the restoration *[- --- -- ἡόπο]ς δ' ἂν ἐκποι]εῖ instead of [- --- -- ἐπειδὰν δ' ἐκποι]εῖ. As a matter of fact boards of epistatai had been responsible for the work on the Parthenon,*

the Nikai, and the Propylaia from their inception. The present passage merely confirms an existing responsibility, and this circumstance is reflected in the phrase *κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφι[σμένα]* in line 5.

This interpretation of the opening lines of the decree obviates the necessity which Wade-Gery felt (*J. H. S.*, LI [1931], p. 60) for understanding *τὸς Ἀθηναίος* as the subject of *χρεῖσθαι* in line 4, allows us to read *ἡ ἀκρόπολις* as subject for both *[ὄρισ]θεῖ* and *ἐπισκευα[σθεῖ]* in line 7, permits the compound verb *[χσυνε]πισ-τατόντ[ο]ν* in line 8 because the regular epistatai of major works on the acropolis have already been mentioned in line 4, and does not compel the rather awkward indentification of the epistatai in line 10 with the tamiai in line 8. As now restored, the decree (down to line 12) outlines two projects for work on the acropolis and in each case designates the responsible overseers. The connective *καὶ* in line 5 makes the transition from Project A to Project B.

Financial provision for the work was made only in the case of the second project, but the old project needed no new financial help from the demos. The overseers of the Parthenon, the Nikai, and the Propylaia were to carry on *κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφι[σμένα]*. From the building records it is clear that the epistatai of the Parthenon and of the Propylaia received some (though not all) of their money from the treasurers of Athena (cf. *I. G.*, I², 339-353, 363-367). The ten talents now authorized for yearly expenditure on the acropolis were all to be paid from Athena's treasure. Lines 12-19 of this decree of Kallias merely provide restrictions on the use of Athena's money above a certain amount for purposes other than those which we have here called projects A and B on the acropolis (lines 2-12).⁸

Next in order on the stone comes the provision for what the hellenotamiai are to do, apparently, with their funds. These two lines (20-21) are crucial for any understanding of Athenian financial policy in the fifth century; they have been much discussed, and different interpretations have been offered for them. The best opinion has been that they provide for the creation of a reserve fund, distinct from the sacred treasure, from which

⁸ There is general agreement about the restoration and interpretation of lines 12-19.

the Athenian state could draw money without borrowing and without paying interest.⁹ The interpretation is essentially the same whether one reads in lines 20-21 τὰ *ἑκά[στοτε γενόμενα* ----] or τὰ *ἑκά[στοτε περιόντα* ----], or even, as Kolbe suggests (*Sitzb. Ak. Berlin*, 1933, p. 164), τὰ *ἑκά[στο μὲνός προσιόντα* ----]. Yet there are difficulties which have not escaped the attention of students of this document. Wade-Gery (*J. H. S.*, LIII [1933], p. 135) makes the very pertinent observation that it is extraordinary to find so important a change in Athenian financial policy stowed away thus inconspicuously. The rest of the decree has nothing whatsoever to do with a state treasure; it is concerned with operations on the acropolis that involve moneys of Athena, with the separation of Athena's money from that of the Other Gods in the Opisthodomos, and with the weighing and counting of Athena's treasures.

Wade-Gery has noted further the difficulty caused by the active verb *κατατιθέναι* for any hypothesis which assumes that the hellenotamiai, after depositing their money with Athena, were themselves to retain possession of it and control over it (*J. H. S.*, LIII [1933], p. 135). The natural mode of expression, with such meaning intended, requires a middle form *κατατίθεσθαι* or (better) *παρακατατίθεσθαι*. We have now to consider also the new restorations possible at the beginning of line 20. Our objections to the traditional [ἐκ | δὲ τῶν φόρο]ν, to Wade-Gery's [καὶ ἐς πόλ]ιν and to Kolbe's [τὸ δὲ λοιπὸ]ν have been indicated above (p. 264). It is, I believe, more than probable that these lines contain no general provision for establishing a state treasure at all, but that they refer closely to what follows in this same document.

If this is true, the accepted restoration and interpretation of these lines are quite erroneous, for they must deal with the repayment of money owed to the Other Gods. My suggestion is that they define the part to be played by Athena's treasurers in the ἀπόδοσις, and that they must be associated closely in reading and interpretation with lines 21-25. A possible restoration of the text, taking into account the letters [----]ιν in line 20, is as follows: [θε | οἷς δὲ πᾶσ]ιν κατατιθέναι κ[ατὰ τὸ]ν

⁹ Ferguson, *Treasurers of Athena*, p. 155, and references there cited. A more complete bibliography will be found in Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, no. 51.

ἐνιαυτὸν τὰ ἡεκά[στοι ὀφελό]μενα παρὰ τ]οῖς ταμίαισι τῶν [τῆς
'Αθ]εναίας τὸς ἔλλενο[ταμίαις].

The hellenotamiai were to deposit during the course of the year the amounts due to each one of the gods with the treasurers of Athena.¹⁰

If I read his argument correctly, I believe that this interpretation was once considered by Wade-Gery and rejected by him because the repayment to the Other Gods was to be made by the prytanes and not by the hellenotamiai (*J. H. S.*, LI [1931], p. 72). It is quite true that the actual repayment was

¹⁰ It may be objected that [θε]οῖς δὲ πᾶσ]ιν implies repayments to Athena as well as to the Other Gods. This is not a serious matter. We know from the records of the logistai that Athena's debt (if any existed) was liquidated in 434/3, for the borrowings began afresh in 433/2. If no money was owed to Athena when Kallias' decree was passed, then [θε]οῖς δὲ πᾶσ]ιν does not, in point of fact, include Athena; if money was owed to Athena in 434/3, then there must have been some decision about repaying it. This ἀπόδοσις may well have been arranged in the decree (now lost) which is generally agreed to have preceded both preserved decrees of Kallias. Except by assuming such a decree, there is no explanation for lines 5-6 of Face A (ἀ ἐς ἀπόδοσιν ἐστιν τοῖς θεοῖς ἐφσεφισμ[έ]να) if Face A technically precedes Face B, or for lines 22-23 of Face B (ἡ ἐς ἀπόδοσιν ἐφ[σεφίστατο ἡ]ο δῆμος τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς) if Face B technically precedes Face A. Once granted that provision had been made for settling Athena's debt in a decree earlier than these two decrees of Kallias, then the words [θε]οῖς δὲ πᾶσ]ιν may with propriety include even Athena, or may (while not including Athena) emphasize the fact that moneys for all the gods (not Athena alone) were to be deposited by the hellenotamiai with the treasurers of Athena. It is not more difficult to interpret θεοῖς πᾶσιν of Face B as "all the Other Gods" than it is to interpret τοῖς θεοῖς as "the Other Gods," which is the meaning it obviously bears in Face A. Other possible restorations for lines 19-21 are [ἐς | δὲ ἀπόδοσ]ιν κατατιθέναι κ[ατὰ τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτὸν τὰ ἡεκά[στοτε δεεθ]έντα παρὰ τ]οῖς ταμίαισι τῶν [τῆς 'Αθ]εναίας τὸς ἔλλενο[ταμίαις], or perhaps [ἐς | δὲ ἀπόδοσ]ιν κατατιθέναι κ[ατὰ τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτὸν τὰ ἡεκά[στοι θεοῖ] ὀφελό]μενα τ]οῖς ταμίαισι τῶν [τῆς 'Αθ]εναίας τὸς ἔλλενο[ταμίαις]. Against the former may be urged the objection that the transition in thought is too abrupt from what precedes. This is or is not, depending upon our point of view, a serious contention. Against the latter is the omission of παρὰ with τοῖς ταμίαισι. I find it hard to believe that κατατιθέναι τοῖς ταμίαισι can mean anything but deposit with (and give possession to) the treasurers. But it is certain that the funds of the hellenotamiai in the years after 434 did not become sacred moneys. If they had, the whole history of borrowings between 433 and 422 would have been quite different (*I. G.*, I², 324).

to be made by the prytanes, but it is equally true that the money for the repayment was to be furnished by the hellenotamiai. This is, in effect, all that lines 19-20 say that they shall do; the words are [---] *κατατιθέναι* ---, not *ἀποδόναι*. The active voice in *κατατιθέναι* is now appropriate, for there is no question of continued control by the hellenotamiai over these deposited funds. Once given into the safekeeping of the treasurers of Athena, the funds passed forever from their possession.

The procedure for finding out what was owed to the other gods was long and tedious (*I. G.*, I², 91, lines 7-13), and might well be expected to continue through the year 434/3. Our new restoration of lines 19-20 implies that the hellenotamiai were to make deposits as required at intervals during the year. One of the arguments which Wade-Gery used in building up his case for a date of the decrees of Kallias later than 434 (though he now believes that 434 is the correct date) was that when these repayments were made there must have been treasurers of the Other Gods to receive them (*J. H. S.*, LI [1931], p. 65). Since the decree of Kallias on Face A (*I. G.*, I², 91) provides that the first board of treasurers of the Other Gods shall be selected at the time of the regular *ἀρχαιεσσίαι* in the spring of 433, Wade-Gery found it difficult to explain what was done with sums ready for repayment before that time. The lines here under consideration supply the answer to that question. Whenever in the course of the year the amount of a debt was known, the money was deposited by the hellenotamiai in safe-keeping with the treasurers of Athena in the Opisthodomos. It was there that the moneys of the Other Gods were to be kept eventually anyway (Face A, line 15; Face B, line 25), and the treasurers of Athena merely provided a place of deposit until the new board of treasurers of the Other Gods could take over. The lines immediately following (21-25) provide that when the repayments have been made the moneys of Athena shall be kept on the right, those of the Other Gods on the left, in the Opisthodomos.

Whatever the formalities of the actual *ἀπόδοσις* by the prytanes in the presence of the Council, and of the erasure of the records of debt (Face A, lines 9-12), I believe that the restoration proposed above expresses correctly what actually happened to the money. The hellenotamiai were obliged to deposit the necessary sums with the treasurers of Athena. That the funds for repay-

ment were to come from them is known already from Face A, line 6.

Kolbe has rightly noted (*Sitzb. Ak. Berlin*, 1933, p. 160) that Face B deals with the treasure of Athena, while Face A deals with the treasure of the Other Gods. The provisions of Face B, lines 19-25, which make reference to the repayments to the Other Gods, find their place in the decree which regulates Athena's affairs because, and only because, Athena offered a temporary refuge for the moneys repaid (lines 19-21), and because some division of space was necessary in the Opisthodomos as soon as the new board should begin to function (lines 21-25).

The restoration proposed above for lines 19-21 of Face B makes this decree far less important for the financial history of Athens than has been generally supposed. The Athenians may have decided in 434 to build from the funds of the hellenotamiai a separate state treasure, but these lines can no longer be cited to prove it. Whatever the decision in 434, no accumulation of reserve was possible anyway until the end of the Archidamian war, when a reserve fund was in fact created (Ferguson, *Treasurers of Athena*, p. 159). But even then, we cannot use the evidence of this decree that the reserve of public moneys was on deposit with Athena's treasurers.

I append here the text of the decree with the new restorations included.

I. G., I², 92 (Face B)

- [Ἔδοξεν τῇ βολῇ καὶ τοῖς δέμοι· Κεκροπὶς ἐπρυτάνευε, Μνεσίθε·]
 [ὅς ἐγραμμάτευε, Ε]ὔπ[ε]ιθες [ἐπεστάτε, Κ]αλλίας ἐπ[ε]κποῖν τὰ ἑνα]
 [ιέτια τὰ λί]θινα καὶ Νί[κας τὰς χ]ρυσᾶς καὶ τὰ Προ[πύλαια· ἡόπο]
 [ς δ' ἂν ἐκποι]εθεῖ παντελὸς [ἐπισκέφ]σει χρῆσθαι ἅπ[αντας τὸς ἐπὶ]
 5 [στατόντας] κατὰ τὰ ἐφσεφι[σμένα·] καὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν [ὀρίζεν πλὴν]
 [ἔ μὲ τὰ ἐχσε]ργμένα καὶ ἐπι[σκευά]ζεν δέκα τάλαντα ἀ[ναλίσκοντα]
 [ς τὸ ἐνιαυτ]ὸ ἡεκάστο ἡέος [ἂν ὀρισ]θεῖ καὶ ἐπισκευα[σθεῖ ὃς κάλλ]
 [ιστα· χ]συνε[πιστατόντ]ο]ν δ[ὲ τῷ ἔρ]γ[ο]ι [ο]ῖ ταμίαι καὶ [ὁ ἀρχιτέκτο]
 [ν· τὸ δὲ γράμ]μα τὸν ἀρχιτέκ[τονα ποι]έν [ὁ]σπερ τῷ Προ[πυλαίον· ἡοῦ]
 10 [τος δὲ ἐπιμ]ελέσ[θο] μετὰ τῷ[ν ἐπιστ]ατῶν ἡόπος ἄριστ[α καὶ ἀκριβέ]
 [στατα ὀρισθ]έσεται ἡε ἀκρ[όπολις] καὶ ἐπισκευασθέ[σεται τὰ δεό]
 [μενα· τοῖς δ]ὲ ἄλλοις χρέμα[σιν τοῖς] τῆς Ἀθηναίας το[ῖς τε νῦν ὄσι]
 [ν ἐμ πόλει κ]αὶ ἡάττ' ἂν τ[ὸ] λο[γιπὸν ἂν] ἀφέρεται μὲ χρῆσ[θ]α[ι μεδὲ ἀπα]

- [ναλίσκεν ἀ]π' αὐτῶν ἐ[ς] ἄλλο μ[εδὲν ἐ] ἐς ταῦτα ἡνπὲρ μυ[ρ]ί[ας δραχμῶν]
- 15 [ς ἐ ἐς ἐπισκ]ευὲν ἑάν τι δέε[ι· ἐς ἄλλ]ο δὲ μεδὲν χρῆσ[θ]α[ι τοῖς χρήμα]
[σιν ἐὰμ μὲ τ]ὲν ἄδειαν φσεφ[ί]σεται ὁ δῆμος καθάπερ ἐ[ὰμ φσεφίσετ]
[αι περὶ ἐσφ]ορᾶς· ἐὰν δέ τις [εἴπει ἐ] ἐπιφσεφί[σ]ει μὲ ἐ[φσεφισμένε]
[ς πο τῆς ἀδεί]ας χρῆσθαι το[ῖς χρήμ]ασιν τοῖ[ς] τῆς Ἀθε[ναίας ἐνεχέ]
[σθο τοῖς α]ὐτοῖς ἡοῖσπερ ἐά[ν τις ἐσ]φένει εἴπει ἐ ἐπιφ[σεφίσει· θε]
20 [οῖς δὲ πᾶσ]ιν κατατιθέναι κ[ατὰ τὸ]ν ἐνιαυτὸν τὰ ἡεκά[στοι ὀφελό]
[μενα παρὰ τ]οῖς ταμίαισι τῶν [τῆς Ἀθ]εναίας τὸς ἔλλενο[ταμίαι· ἐπε]
[ιδὼν δ' ἀπὸ] τ[ῶ]ν διακοσίων τα[λάντο]ν ἡὰ ἐς ἀπόδοσιν ἐφ[σεφίσατο ἡ]
[ο δῆμος τοῖ]ς ἄλλοις θεοῖς ἀ[ποδοθ]εῖ τὰ ὀφελόμενα τα[μινέσθο τ]
[ὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀθ]εναίας χρήματα [ἐν τῷ] ἐπὶ δεχσιὰ τῷ Ὀπισ[θοδόμο, τὰ δ]
25 [ἐ τῶν ἄλλον θ]εῶν ἐν τῷ ἐπ' ἀρ[ιστερ]ά.
[ἡπόσα δὲ τῶ]ν χρεμάτων τῶν [ἡιερῶ]ν ἄστατά ἐστιν ἐ ἀν[αρίθμετα ἡ]
[οι ταμίαι] ἡ[ο]ι νῦν μετὰ τῶν τε[ττάρω]ν ἀρχῶν ἡαὶ ἐδίδο[σαν τὸν λόγ]
[ον τὸν ἐκ Πα]ναθηναίων ἐς Παν[αθένα]ια ἡπόσα μὲν χρυ[σᾶ] ἐστιν αὐ[τῶν]
[τῶν ἐ ἀργυρᾶ] ἐ ὑπάργυρα στε[σάντον, τὰ δ] ἐ ἄλλ[α ἀριθμεσάντον ...]
- 30 -----

BENJAMIN D. MERITT.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

REPORTS.

GLOTTA, XXII (1933), 1-2.

Pp. 1-27. W. Kroll, *Die Entwicklung der lateinischen Schriftsprache*, seeks to draw a picture of the older Latin and of its differences from the classical form as standardized notably by Cicero. This older Latin was characterized by unstable orthography; by variety of inflectional forms of the same function and of derivative words of the same meaning; by syntactical anacolutha, case-attractions, parataxis (instead of hypotaxis); by rarity of sentence connectives, the use of the pronoun *is* and its forms where they were not needed, unskillful placing of subordinate clauses; by a certain confusion between adjectives and adverbs in syntactical use; by the free employment of rare and foreign words (where purism later prevailed); by discrepancies in agreements (i. e., *constructiones ad sensum*); by use of active as well as of passive forms of the "deponent" verbs; by use or omission of prepositions in the same case-construction; etc. Cicero built up the standard of use, eliminating alternatives and introducing logical forms of expression. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (which Kroll definitely pronounces to be the work of Cornificius) shows some peculiarities of the earlier Latin, but these have been magnified by modern scholars.

Pp. 27-31. J. Whatmough, *The Raeti and their Language*, opposes Thurneysen's view (*Glotta* XXI, 1 ff.) that the Raetian letter like B with three pointed loops is to be read z, which gives a word *zinace* in Raetian as well as in Etruscan; the sign is rather for *þ*. Raetian is closer to Indo-European than is generally supposed, though it shows Etr. influence. The inscription on the "paletta di Padova" (a small fire-shovel or paddle) is thus interpreted:

etsua leutiku kaian nakina tarisakvil "hanc publicam caiam (or hoc publicum vatillum) (dedit) Nacina Tarisaquil." Whatmough rejects Kretschmer's view (*Symbola Danielsson dicata*, 134 ff.) that the Raetian words in -ke and -xe in the inscc. of Magrè are all verbs; some are more easily taken as personal names.

Pp. 31-42. Karl Karényi, *Pannonia*, interprets as 'Pan's Land', finding a root *pā-n-eu- 'swell, be full' in Πάν 'god Pan', πᾶς 'all', Πηνειός 'river Peneus', Latin *pānis* 'raised bread' (borrowed from an Illyrian source by the Latins), etc., etc. Cf. also Hesych. Πανία as an old name of the Peloponnesus.

Pp. 42-46. P. Wahrmann, *Κανναβάριοι, ἀσκομίσθαι*, new words in the inscriptions of Ephesus. The first is from *κάνναβις* 'hemp', = Latin *stupparius* (*C. G. L.*, II, 338); the second names the *utricularii*, contractors who rented out skins for the transport of wine and oil.

Pp. 46-100. E. Locker, *Die Bildung der griechischen Kurz- und Kosenamen* (continued from XXI, 136-152). When no formative element is added to the shortened name, the final vowel is often changed to *ō* (fem. *ā*) or *ī*. The formative elements are then treated, each with a chronological list of occurrences and a discussion of its origin, function, and history: *-ískos*; *-íchos*, *-áchos*; *λ*-suffixes, *-ύλος*, *-υλλος*, *-ίλος*, *-ιλλος*, *-αλο*- and its extensions; oxytones in *-ιδ-*; *-ιον*; *-ίνος*, *-ίνος*, *-ίνας*, *-ίνης*, *-ίνης*, *-ιννα*, *-ίνη*, *-ινᾶ*; *-ώνη*, *-όννας*; *-έας*; barytones in *-ις*; *-υς*; *-ας*, *-ās*; *κ*-suffixes, of which there is a great variety; and those containing labial stops.

Pp. 100-122. P. Kretschmer, *Nordische Lehnwörter im Altgriechischen*, maintains that Greek *πύργος* and *Πέργαμος* came into Greek through Macedonian from a Germanic language, cf. Burg and Berg (whose variant vocalism is derived from vowel variations in the paradigm); the word meant 'stronghold, place of refuge', like *πόλις* (Vedic *pūr*), O. Ir. *dūn*, Lat. *arx*, etc. *Πύργος* replaced older Greek *τύρσις* (taken from a pre-Greek Mediterranean language), and sets the first sound-shift of Germanic before 1000 B. C. Other words which may have come by the same route are *κο(μ)μάρα* (Hesych.) 'lobster', also *κύμαρος* and *κάμμαρος* (Athen., VII, 306), cf. O. Norse *humarr*, German *Hummer*; Maced. *ἄλιζα*, Gmc. *Aliso*, OHG *elira*; Att. *πύνδαξ* (= *πυθμήν*); and probably *ἵππος*, whose first vowel and rough breathing are unexplainable in Greek.

Pp. 122-127. H. Krahe, *Illyrisches* (cf. XX, 188 ff.): (4) Zum Wandel *ē* > *ā* im Eleischen: The same change is found in Illyrian names, and traces are found in Messapian; Illyrian influence in Elis is found in the personal name *Τευτίαπλος* (Thuc., III, 29, 2), and in the Elean official title *ἀλύτας*, which came from Dodona. Further, the Mess. gen. *-āos* and the Elean gen. *-āos* (*ιαρᾶος*) may both come from *-ēuos*. (5) Illyr. *barb-* und *bard-*: The name *Scenobarbus* is Latinized from *Σκενόβαρδος* (found in Dio Cass. LV, 33, 2), and contains the element meaning 'beard'; similarly *Barbaruta* (*C. I. L.*, V, 5033) is a masc. cognomen, 'Redbeard'. Thus the Illyr. word *bard-* 'beard' is found, to be kept distinct from Illyr. *bard-* 'swamp' in *Barbanna* (river in Illyricum) and *Metubarbis* (an island in the Save).

Pp. 128-135. G. Hatzidakis, *Miszellen zur griech. Grammatik*. (1) Die Aoriste auf *-εσα*, instead of *-ησα*, in Mod. Greek, are due to the analogy of other aorists of verbs of similar or opposite meanings, where the short vowel was historically correct. (2) Bedeutungsentwicklung einiger Verben: *βρομεῖ* 'stinkt', changed from 'brummt', by association with *πέρδεταί*. Mod. *γέρνω* 'neige, sinke', from Anc. *ἐγείρω* 'erhebe', because when

one part of an object is lifted the other goes down (cf. scale-pans). Mod. ἐμπορῶ 'can' is from εὐπορος: εὐπορῶ, modern pron. ἐπορῶ, remodeled after ἔμπορος. Βαρέω 'schlage', from 'erschwere, belaste', because of βαρεά 'Hammer', from ἡ βαρεῖα, sc. σφύρα. (3) Verba, die von Nomina auf -μα gebildet sind, never take the form -μέω; therefore βρομεῖ 'stinkt' is from ὁ βρόμος and not from τὸ βρῶμα. (4) The name Morea for the Peloponnesus is from ἡ μορέα 'mulberry tree', not from a hypothetical pre-Homeric Phoenician colony, which called the land ἡ Μώρα, ethnic ὁ Μωρεύς, whence modern ὁ Μορεάς; for apart from the hypothetical character of the colony, such ethnics do not develop into geographical names. (5) Στήμα — στάμα — στέμα are all from the root of ἵστημι; στήμα is old, στάμα is recent and means 'point', στέμα is recent and means 'instant'. The vowels of the last two are analogical to various forms of the verb.

Pp. 135-140. V. Pisani, Die oskische Inschrift Conway 132 (v. Planta 164), takes the object as a form for cutting dough into cakes, and reads: pupu fri pukelled ehad 'Koch, backe mit dieser Form'. Pupu = Lat. *coque*, with change of the second vowel as of the first. Fri = Lat. *frige*, with loss of final vowel, as in *dic*, *dūc*, etc. Pukelled, abl. in -līd or -līād, dimin. to stem in Lat. *bicarium*, one modern representative of which is Ital. *pécchero*, showing variation in the initial consonant (prob. from a pre-Italic Medit. language). Ehad = Lat. *eā(d)*, with h to mark hiatus.

Pp. 140-152. St. Weinstock, Tellus, considers the older etymologies dubious and seeks the meaning in religious observances of the Tellus cult: *feriae sementivae*, *Fordicidia*, offering of the *porca praecedanea*. Varro (ap. Aug., *de Civ. Dei* VII, 23) associates Tellus and Tellumo (her masc. counterpart) with Altor and Rusor; Altor is obviously the nourisher of all things born; Rusor is obscure, but most probably **revorsor*, related to *verto*, as a helping god at the new upturning of the earth. (To be continued)

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

REVIEWS.

AURELIO ESPINOSA PÓLIT, S. J. *Virgilio el Poeta y su Mision Providencial*. Prólogo del Dr. Remigio Crespo Toral. Quito, Editorial Ecuatoriana, 1932. Pp. xlviii, 546.

Ecuador is in a blaze of literary Renaissance. History, medicine, sculpture, poetry, the novel, are represented by excellent books, printed and published in Ecuador itself. Nor are the classics forgotten. In 1931 a group of Latinists brought out a volume for the anniversary, "A Virgilio. Estudios Virgilianos," and this is now followed by Pólit's study of one aspect of Virgil. The prologue, by Crespo Toral, calls attention to the reestablishment of chairs of Greek and Latin in the University of Quito, abolished in a recent revolution.

Espinosa Pólit, a young Jesuit scholar, began a critical study of Virgil's originality, but it developed into what to him is triumphant proof of Virgil's providential mission as precursor of Christianity. He admits lack of originality in this thesis, but feels that he has made a contribution in the fulness and harmony of the data assembled. He has an astounding acquaintance with recent writing on Virgil, and refers to, or quotes, Rand, Whicher, Tenney Frank, Duane Stuart, Paribeni, Carcopino, Jeanmaire, Hubaux, Conway, Fowler, Heinze and a host of other scholars. His style is graceful, and whatever one thinks of his argument, any lover of Virgil who reads Spanish will find Pólit's chapters full of understanding and charm.

C. U. CLARK.

THE CITY COLLEGE, NEW YORK.

PIERRE CHANTRAINE. *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (= Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, xxxviii). Champion, Paris, 1933. xxvii + 473 pp. 125 francs.

Beyond doubt this volume is destined to be the standard work upon its theme, and in general linguistic interest it even exceeds that of its author's *Histoire du parfait grec* (Paris, 1927 = vol. xxi of the same series). It consists of forty-three chapters which omit no noun-formation of consequence (it is not serious that the type of *γενέθλιος* seems not to be noted), not only dealing exhaustively with formation proper, but also treating of semantic classifications (e. g. for masculines in *-ā*, religious, poetic, and technical compounds, as well as hypocoristics and popular words

in *-ās*, pp. 26-32), of semantic development (e. g. the diminutive force of *-ιον*, pp. 64-68), and of the special force of morphemes (e. g. *-μη*, pp. 149-150). Homeric and Classical Greek naturally receive the fullest consideration, but the dialects, the *Κοινή*, and the papyri likewise have due attention, and brief reference is made, wherever relevant, to old survivals in Modern Greek. On the other hand, there are only occasional allusions to Mediaeval (Byzantine) Greek, though abundant material for this period is contained in S. B. Psaltēs's *Grammatik der byzantinischen Chroniken* (Göttingen, 1913). The list of such correspondences seems worth noting: *-ιος* (Chantraine, p. 38 : Psaltēs, pp. 288-289), *-ειος* (53 : 289; three instances), *-τήριον* (64 : 282), *-ίδιον* (71 : 276), *-άδιον* (72 : 277), *-άκιον* (73, 380 : 277-278), *-άριον* (74 : 278; largely < Latin *-arius*), *-ία* (83 : 260-262), *-σία* (86, 289 : 263-265), *-εια* (88 : 262; rather rare), *-εία* (90 : 263), *-οια* (91 : 263; five instances), *-έα* (92 : 267-268; sometimes < Lat. *-ea*), *-αινα* (109 : 269; rare), *-ωσα* (110 : 268-269), *-εύς* (131 : 254; only *ἀπομονεύς*), *-μος* (136 : 257-258), *-μιος*, *-σιμος* (157 : 297), *-ών* (165 : 255; six instances), *-μα* (190 : 284-286), *-εινός* (196 : 296; two instances), *-ινός* (201 : 295-296), *-ινος* (203 : 294-295), *-ίνα* (205 : 269; two instances), *-ίνος* (206 : 296; mostly < Lat. *-inus*), *-ηνός* (206 : 296-297; only proper names), *-σύνη* (213 : 267; very rare), *-ερός*, *-ηρός* (230 : 301), *-σία* (289 : 264-265), *-ότης* (298 : 266-267), *-ωτός* (305 : 300-301), *-τός* (307 : 299-300), *-της* (320 : 249-252), *-(σ)τρον* (332 : 282; five instances), *-ίς* (348 : 268), *-ικός* (396 : 289-294), *-ίσκος* (412 : 257; two instances), *-ώδης* (432 : 301; very rare).

One might wish that M. Chantraine had given more attention to accent, particularly where Vedic shows similar phenomena; but he has thus noted only the *-o*-stems accented on the base to express action, and on the morpheme to express agent (e. g. *τόμος* 'cut' : *τομός* 'cutting' :: Vedic *kāma-* 'love' : *kāmā-* 'loving'; pp. 7-8, cf. B. Lindner, *Altindische Nominalbildung*, Jena, 1878, pp. 29-30). He observes (p. 18) that the reverse holds in Greek for *-ā*-stems (e. g. *πάθη* 'suffering' : *βολή* 'act of hurling'), but it is equally true of Vedic (e. g. *irā* 'draught' : *jarā* 'act of growing old'; Lindner, pp. 151-152); and accent-variations are also found both in Greek and Vedic for stems in *-u-* (e. g. *γένυς* = Ved. *hānus* 'jaw' : *λιγνός* 'smoking fire', cf. Ved. *nrtū-* 'dancer'; Lindner, pp. 61-64), *-mo-* (e. g. *δήμος* 'territory' : *δωγμός* 'chase' :: Ved. *yákṣma-* 'disease' : *ajinā-* 'running'; Lindner, pp. 90-91), *-mē/ōn-* (e. g. *ἀλήμων* 'wandering' : *ἡγεμών* 'leader' :: Ved. *bhāsman-* 'chewing' : *dāmān-* 'giver'; Lindner, p. 93), *-no-* (e. g. *αἶνος* 'tale' : *καπνός* 'smoke' :: Ved. *svāpna-* 'sleep' : *stenā-* 'thief'; Lindner, p. 86), *-ro-* (e. g. *σαῦρος* 'lizard' : *νεβρός* 'fawn' :: Ved. *vājra-* 'thunderbolt' : *usrā-* 'bull'; Lindner, pp. 100-102; the anti-

thesis in accent between, e. g., Greek ἀγρός and Ved. ájra- 'field' may imply a difference of underlying concept). This whole subject seems to merit further investigation.

It would also have been well to have accented the Vedic words throughout; as it is, the accentuation is marked only sporadically (for *kusṭah*, p. 275, read *kúṣṭah*; for *lopāṣah*, p. 376, read *lopāṣāh*; for *uṣā*, p. 422, read *uṣāh*).

A few minor additions and corrections may likewise be noted. There seems to be no way of determining whether Boeotian and certain other North-West dialects had *ā* or *ǎ* in the nominative (p. 26): Thessalian *πυθιονικα*, *ολυμπιονικα*, Acarnanian *ιππονικα* (SGDI N 791 b⁹⁻¹⁰, 1400²) — the clearest examples — are ambiguous; and Homeric nominatives of this type (e. g. *κvanoχαῖτα*, N 563, ζ 390) show -ǎ (the true explanation seems given by H. Hirt, *Handbuch der griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*², Heidelberg, 1912, p. 340 [alternation of Indo-European *a* and *ǎ*]; for the Homeric material see G. Vogrinz, *Grammatik des homerischen Dialektes*, Paderborn, 1889, pp. 59-60). The formations in -ιδιος (pp. 39-40) apparently find parallels in Celtic (e. g. Old Irish *humaide* 'made of copper': *humae* 'copper' < **omiio-dio*-; cf. H. Pedersen, *Vergleichende Grammatik der keltischen Sprachen*, Göttingen, 1909-13, ii, 28) and Baltic (e. g. Lithuanian *gaidys* 'cock' < **gai-dio*-; cf. Brugmann, i, 177; II, iii, 379). To the rare formations in -έσιος (p. 42) may be added Corcyran *σιτηρεσιον*, found five times in SGDI 3206; to those in -εος (p. 51), Coan *κοτυλεα* (ib. 3637²⁵, 3638¹² = Schwyzer 251 B, C); -ασσα occurs in Cretan *ηρωασσα* (SGDI 4952a³³ = Schwyzer 193) beside Cnidian *ηρωισσα* (Schwyzer 266; cf. Chantraine, p. 110); to the forms in -φος (p. 123) one may add Cyprian *αλφον* (SGDI 60⁹, 18, 21 = Schwyzer 679; for conjectures as to the etymology see H. F. Standerwick, *Etymological Studies in the Greek Dialect-Inscriptions*, Baltimore, 1932, pp. 64-65); to those in -ονο- (pp. 206-207), the masculine *τορονος*· *τόρνος*. *Ταραντίνοι* (Hesychios); to those in -όλης (p. 237), Corinthian *τριγόλας* (Sophron, 50); to the compound suffixes in -λ- (pp. 253 sqq.), the types of *θεμέλιος*, *θήμελον*, Homeric *θεμέλια*, Cretan *θεμηλιον* (SGDI 5045³; cf. W. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae*, Gütersloh, 1892, p. 224; for Middle Greek morphemes in -άλιον, -ήλιον see Psaltes, pp. 279-280, 281); the relation of the difficult Delphic *τρικτενα* (SGDI 2501³⁴ = Schwyzer 325) to Corinthian *τρικτυς* might have been considered; to the formations in -ετος (pp. 299-300) might be added Cretan *βιετος* (SGDI 5084¹⁰); and beside *ἄροτρον* (p. 331) one finds Gortynian *αρατρον* (ib. 4992 A, II⁵ = Schwyzer 180).

The reviewer desires to state explicitly that these suggested corrections and additions are to be construed only as favourable and constructive criticism of a volume of which he entertains the highest opinion.

LOUIS H. GRAY.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

HERBERT NESSELHAUF. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der delisch-attischen Symmachie. *Klio*, Beiheft XXX (1933). Pp. vii + 144.

This volume contains four chapters: (I) Von der Symmachie zur ἀρχή [1-35]; (II) Die Blütezeit der athenischen ἀρχή [35-69]; (III) Die ersten Kriegsjahre [69-94]; and (IV) Die Phorosveränderungen von 454-431 [95-120]. Following these is an appendix on the colonies and cleruchies of the years 448-446 [120-140], and finally an addendum [140-141] in which the author takes cognizance of Meritt's *Athenian Financial Documents*, which was not available to him before his book went to the printer. The use of the volume is facilitated by an index and a list of the inscriptions cited.

Nesselhauf begins with a consideration of the extent of the Athenian empire in 454. He argues that the transformation from league to empire had been in large part achieved, and that the furnishing of ships had already been commuted to payment of tribute (except for Samos, Lesbos, and Chios) at least as early as this date [p. 4]. This view differs from that offered by West (*Amer. Hist. Rev.*, XXXV [1930], 267 ff.), who has argued that some of the islands, at least, were still furnishing ships after 454.

With sound historical judgment, Nesselhauf connects the removal of the treasury of the empire from Delos to Athens in 454 with the Egyptian disaster, which he dates in 455/4. He also shows that Myronides' expedition to Thessaly and Perikles' expedition to Acarnania both belong in the year 455/4 (Thuc. I, 111), and that their return home without success was made necessary by news of the catastrophe in Egypt. It is a very happy combination to associate the treaty between Athens and Phokis (*I. G.*, I², 26) and the oaths taken in the archonship of Ariston (454/3) with the campaign of Myronides [p. 8]. Nesselhauf explains the absence of tribute payments by many of the islands in the years immediately following 454 as a consequence of the loss of Athenian naval power when the fleet was destroyed in Egypt.

In his discussion of the tribute payments of the second assessment period, Nesselhauf demonstrates that *I. G.*, I², 196 and 198 (upper part) can be made to correspond not only in names, but also in amounts of recorded tithe. His suggested restorations [p. 18] of [HH^ΠΔΔΔΓ] † † † † † Τετέδιοι in 196 and [H]H^ΠΔΔΔ Τετέδ[ω]ι Γ[† † † † †] in 198 seem to the present reviewer possible, with considerable crowding in 196; and ΠΔ Λαμ[φσακενοί ΔΔΓ††††] in line 59 of 198 is certainly possible if it be assumed that the numeral ran over into the end of line 60. The conclusion which Nesselhauf draws: that the delayed partial payments

of 198 belong only to original partial payments of 198 is attractive, but a skeptic will still doubt whether the absence of some such phrase as *περυσινού φόρου* with such late partial payments is proof that they did not belong to an earlier year; and it is perhaps legitimate to suggest that the *ὀφειλήματα ἐν τῇσι στήλῃσι* of the Methone decree (*I. G.*, I², 57) may be something other than arrears in tribute. Nesselhauf's case is a good one, except that certain partial payments in 196 (as, e. g., for Torone) combine very well with late partial payments in 198, and that the stone is so preserved before *Σίγγοι* in 196 as to show that the quota from 198 cannot be restored there. One error of detail should be noted about the quota of Dikaia in *I. G.*, I², 195. Nesselhauf claims that the restoration [H] in *S. E. G.*, V [5, III, 10] is arbitrary, and suggests [HHHH] instead. This is impossible, and the reason why it is impossible is given in *S. E. G.*, V in the commentary on this line.

In even more convincing fashion, Nesselhauf associates the increased number of cities paying tribute in 450/49 with the renewal of war against Persia and Kimon's expedition, which left Athens before the end of the year 451/0 [pp. 24-25]. The presence of Kimon near the Caric coast explains the payments by Caric cities at the very end of *I. G.*, I², 194. Finally, the Peace with Persia, and the fact that by virtue of the peace the principal reason for the existence of the Delian Confederacy was removed, explain the absence of late partial payments in *I. G.*, I², 196 and the extraordinarily short list *I. G.*, I², 197. By reference to the quota lists, Nesselhauf dates the Peace after the Dionysia of 448, though still in the course of the same summer [p. 28]. The main thesis, that there is a direct connection between the Peace and the poor collection of tribute in 448, seems unmistakably sound; but the inscriptions cited, notably *I. G.*, I², 196, 197, and 198, seem to the present writer still so much in need of study that it is hazardous to claim from them now certain proof of the exact date of the Peace or even a certain reflection of the exact consequences of the Peace. Nesselhauf justly claims that the resumption of tribute payments after this temporary lapse marks the turn from League to Empire, and he notes the importance of the colonies and cleruchies established by Perikles for consolidating this empire. The appendix [pp. 120-140] which deals with the colonies and cleruchies justifies the historical significance given to them in the present chapter.

In his second chapter, Nesselhauf analyzes the quota lists of the third assessment period (446/5-444/3), and shows that the division of the empire into five geographical districts was already effected in 446. The reorganization of 443, which is reflected in the quota lists, still remains an important fact, however, in the

consolidation of the empire. That its fundamental importance is not so great as has been generally thought Nesselhauf rightly emphasizes [pp. 39-41].

In the discussion of the fourth assessment period there is a good explanation of the troublesome *ἐπιφορά*: a penalty or increment exacted for delayed payments. The *ἐπιφορά* does not appear first with the beginning of an assessment period (*I. G.*, I², 205 instead of *I. G.*, I², 202), but Nesselhauf is probably wrong in saying that it has nothing to do with the assessments [pp. 52, 73]. He points out an error made by West and Meritt (cf. *S. E. G.*, V, p. 24), when he shows that *ἐπιφορά* may be collected in one year and not in the next without assuming that an assessment intervened. In individual cases this may be true, but when all payments of *ἐπιφορά* ceased, there is a logical presumption that the system of tribute collection on which the *ἐπιφορά* depended had been changed and that the authorization for this change was made at the time of a general assessment. There are no recorded instances of payment of *ἐπιφορά* in the assessment period to which *I. G.*, I², 218 and 216 belong [cf. Meritt, *Ath. Fin. Doc.*, p. 9], and it seems to the present reviewer still, in spite of Nesselhauf's argument [p. 52], a legitimate conclusion that no *ἐπιφορά* was expected, or at least that it was not so listed on the quota lists even if collected. The one item *ἐν ἐπιφορᾷ* in *I. G.*, I², 218 shows that *ἐπιφορά* was expected in the preceding assessment period and that *I. G.*, I², 218 itself belongs in the first year of a new period.

Nesselhauf proposes [p. 53] in *I. G.*, I², 207 and 209 Ionic lists longer by five names, and Hellespontine lists shorter by five names, than those shown in *S. E. G.*, V. It is possible that he is right, but the exact length of the lists must remain very much a matter of conjecture. Almost nothing is preserved on the stone [West and Meritt will publish soon one small fragment], and there is no certainty about the number of cities in either panel that paid *ἐπιφορά* in any given year.

In dealing with the quota lists at the beginning of the Archidamian war Nesselhauf enters a highly controversial field. He argues for general assessments in 435, 431, and 428. Shortly before the appearance of Nesselhauf's treatise Meritt's *Ath. Fin. Doc.* appeared with a statement of the case for 428. Nesselhauf reached the same conclusion independently [p. 140]. His claims for 435 and 431, however, are not well founded. To come to the heart of the matter, we have [p. 69] Nesselhauf's statement "Für eine Schätzung ist jedenfalls die Zahlung der ὀθόριοι ἀτακτοὶ das einzig sichere Indiz; sie ist somit 435 anzusetzen." It is clear from the quota lists that in 436/5 the name ὀθόριοι was listed without the modifier ἀτακτοὶ, and that in 435/4 the name appears with the modifier ἀ[τακτοὶ]. The restoration is

certain. Nesselhauf's argument is that, since the Othoroi were regularly assessed in 436/5 and not regularly assessed in 435/4, we must assume that the name was dropped from the assessment roll at the time of a general reassessment, which is thus datable by the evidence in 435. The fallacy lies in the assumption that the Othoroi were regularly assessed in 436/5 because they were not listed as *ἄτακτοι*. They may perfectly well have been *ἄτακτοι* in fact, even though not so recorded on the quota list. One must always remember that the important elements of the record were the name of the city making payment and the amount of the quota; a scribe might or might not indicate whether the payment was made according to an assessment or without assessment. This change from *Ὀθόριοι* to *Ὀθόριοι ἄτακτοι* offers not the slightest evidence for an assessment in 435; but other considerations point preponderantly to 434. Nesselhauf makes little of the fact that the tribute of Spartolos was increased in 434/3 from 2 talents to 3½ talents. This is important, for it was one of the motivating factors in the revolt of Bottice, Chalcidice, and Potidaea in 432. Still more important was the increase in tribute for Potidaea from 6 talents to 15 talents between 435/4 and 433/2. This Nesselhauf does not mention, and it is a damaging omission. The change in assessment came obviously in 434 at the same time with the change for Spartolos, and certainly had a direct bearing on the revolt two years later.

Nesselhauf further argues for an assessment in 435 by his interpretation of the special rubrics *πόλεις αὐταὶ φόρον ταχσάμεναι* and *πόλεις ἃς οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρειν*, which first appear in 434/3. But his interpretation cannot be accepted. The former of these rubrics received a full discussion by E. B. Couch in *A. J. A.*, XXXIII (1929), 502-514, and the demonstration was made by her that there could be no question of privilege implied by the heading *πόλεις αὐταὶ ταχσάμεναι*. Yet Nesselhauf writes [p. 56] "Wir werden sehen, dass es sich um freiwillige Verpflichtungen zur Zahlung handelt." It is indeed hard to reconcile the granting of special privilege in 434 with revolt in 432, as must be done if Nesselhauf's interpretation is right. But Nesselhauf does not know Couch's article. The rubric reflects attempts at *ἀπόταξις* on the part of Athens, and may be translated "cities that accepted separate assessments of tribute." Many of them were Bottic and Chalcidic towns, now separated in tribute assessment from Spartolos and Olynthos; they accepted the separate assessments because they were compelled to do so, not because of any initiative on their part; they chafed under the burden; and those who were able revolted from Athens along with Spartolos, Olynthos, and Potidaea. The appearance of these rubrics in 434/3, which proves the changed status of many tributary states from their former category of *ἄτακτοι*, is

in reality a powerful argument in favor of reassessment in 434, not in 435.

Since much of Nesselhauf's argument about the second rubric πόλεις ἡὰς οἱ ἰδιῶται ἐνέγραψαν φόρον φέρειν depends on his interpretation of the first, his entire hypothesis is vitiated and cannot be used to prove anything about assessments in 435 and 431. The present reviewer believes that the assessment dates 434 and 430 may still be considered correct, that there is definite proof for the former and a very strong case for the latter (*I. G.*, I², 218 and 216 in 430/29 and 429/8 respectively). The criticisms of Couch's explanation of αὐταὶ ταχσάμεναι made by Gomme in *Cl. Rev.*, XLVII (1933), 132 and Lenschau in *Jahresb. ü. d. Fortschritte d. kl. Altertumswissenschaft*, 240 (1934), 52-53 do not go to the heart of the matter and becloud the issue.

In view of these circumstances it seems necessary to call attention to the unjustifiable nature of much of the argument in Nesselhauf's addendum [pp. 140-141]. The validity of the secretary cycle of the ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ is underrated; it extended not merely from 434/3 to 430/29, but began at least as early as 439/8, probably in 443/2. Nor can the cycle for secretaries of the hellenotamiai be dismissed as pure hypothesis and nothing more. The completion of the normal cycle makes impossible a date for *I. G.*, I², 216 in 430/29, which Nesselhauf proposes. The special rubrics of *I. G.*, I², 218 do not depend on Meritt's restorations, as Nesselhauf implies. The difficult restorations are in *I. G.*, I², 216; but the difficulties are not solved by Nesselhauf's suggestions which involve the erroneous interpretations indicated above. It is possibly true that *I. G.*, I², 214 does not belong in 428/7; but it is extraordinary to think of Athens leaving the Aktaian cities without assessment from the time of their capture in 427 to 425, which is what Nesselhauf claims. Nor can Nesselhauf legitimately disregard the evidence for assessments which Meritt adduces from the tribute-collecting expeditions of 430, 428, and 425/4. To say that Melesander's expedition in early winter of 430 was connected with the tribute assessment of 431 is to allow twelve months too many to intervene before the expedition set forth. The assessment is better dated in 430, with the departure of the expedition soon after.

In Nesselhauf's third chapter the discussion of the special rubrics is continued with reference to *I. G.*, I², 216 and 218, but still with the assumption that the πόλεις αὐταὶ ταχσάμεναι were cities not assessed by Athens [p. 71]. The whole problem needs further study in the light of a fresh interpretation of *I. G.*, I², 63 [cf. Meritt and West, *The Athenian Assessment of 425 B. C.* (1934)]. The restoration χίλιοι in *I. G.*, I², 63, line 58 is surely wrong, but in spite of this Nesselhauf's interpretation of the general procedure of assessment [p. 72, note 1] is probably cor-

rect. The tribute of Notion in the year of *I. G.*, I², 214/5 was not 200 Dr. [p. 75], but 100 Dr. [cf. also Meritt and West, *op. cit.*, p. 72]. Nesselhauf may, however, be right in rejecting the quota [Γ+]|||| for Anaphe and suggesting [ΔΓ+]|||| instead. If so, we should also read [ΔΓ+||]|| for Myndos [*S. E. G.*, V, 29]. Nesselhauf assumes as possible the addition of one or two names to the Thracian list in *I. G.*, I², 212 [p. 57, note 1; p. 98]. As a matter of fact the fragments of this inscription are all definitely placed [*A. J. A.*, XXXIII (1929), 382], and the length of the list is correct as given in *S. E. G.*, V, 22. On the other hand, Nesselhauf is undoubtedly right in suggesting [p. 69, note 2] that the restoration now given in *S. E. G.*, V [28, I, 19] as [Πιττα]ῖοι should be changed to [Ἐρυθρα]ῖοι.

In arguing for the dates of *I. G.*, I², 216 and 218 Nesselhauf uses also the evidence of the Methone decree (*I. G.*, I², 57) and calls attention to the fact that mention of *hoi στρατιῶται hoι ἐμ Ποτειδάαι* does not preclude a date before the capture of Potidaea. His reasoning here is eminently sound [p. 83, note 1], but the date 430/29 is still available for the Methone decree, and to the present reviewer the discussion of the tribute in the decree indicates that it belongs in the year of a general assessment. Nesselhauf denies this categorically [p. 82], but he assumes that in a year of general assessment the demos would not be called upon to decide whether a city should pay tribute or not. Surely the demos could vote on a question of privilege in tribute assessment in any year it so chose, and of all years the question was most apt to arise in an assessment year. Nesselhauf makes a strong argument also from the phrase *τοῖς προτέροις Παναθηναίοις*, when previously tribute had been assessed on Methone. He urges that this cannot have been the Great Panathenaia, because the word *μεγάλους* is omitted. But the objection is groundless (e. g., *I. G.*, I², 324 *passim*); since we are dealing with a year of tribute assessment it is merely a question of choosing between 434 and 430, and both were Panathenaic years.

In Nesselhauf's fourth chapter on the changes in tribute from 454 to 431 the attempt is made to determine the approximate amounts of tribute in the various assessment periods, particularly I, IV, and VI. The conclusion is [p. 108] that the tribute from 454 to 451 amounted to *ca.* 487 talents, from 443 to 439 to *ca.* 398 talents, and from 435 [434] to 432 [431] to *ca.* 429 talents. It would take too long here to enter into the details of Nesselhauf's argument, but some control over the method of his investigation can be obtained by studying the results. Let us note, meanwhile, that Tod [*Gr. Hist. Inscr.*, p. 56] gives 369 instead of 487 talents for Period I, 349 + 30 app. = 379 instead of 398 talents for Period IV, and 388 instead of 429 talents for Period VI. There is little chance for difference of opinion in

the fourth period, for the lists are there unusually well preserved. A figure approximating 396 talents is undoubtedly correct.

One list of the sixth period (*I. G.*, I², 212) is fairly well preserved and may be almost completely restored [Tod, *op. cit.*, no. 56]. The total tribute for the names given in Tod's restoration is 328 talents, 4305 dr., to which must be added that of five Island items, nine Ionic items, and five Thracian items lost from the stone and not restored. The missing Island names increase the total tribute by 28 talents, 3000 dr. Even if all the eight Thracian names suggested as possible by Tod in his commentary are added, the tribute is increased further only by about 27 talents; and if the twelve names (occupying 14 lines) which appear in *I. G.*, I², 213 and not in *I. G.*, I², 212 are all added to the Ionic list for the nine lines there unrestored, the total is increased only by about 10 talents more. The absolute maximum for the tribute collected in 433/2 (*I. G.*, I², 212) thus appears to be less than 394 talents. Tod's estimate of 388 talents is surely more nearly correct than Nesselhauf's estimate of 429 talents. The physical limitations of the stone prevent the addition of more names to achieve the higher figure. It should be noted that Nesselhauf's argument for this period includes also *I. G.*, I², 210.

A control is more difficult for the first period, but even if Tod's suggested 369 talents seem too low a figure, the present reviewer feels that Nesselhauf's suggested 487 talents are far too high. Nesselhauf does not discuss the possible tribute of the third assessment period, where the exact income from the tribute in one year (444/3) may be determined with great probability as 376 talents, 4550 dr. [*I. G.*, I², 342; cf. Tod, *op. cit.*, p. 56].

It has always been a problem to reconcile the low figure of yearly tribute in the sixth period with Thucydides' report of the 600 talents a year just before the outbreak of the war. Nesselhauf gives a very convincing explanation, as a suggestion from Kolbe: *προσιόντων μὲν ἑξακοσίων τάλαντων ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ φόρον κατ' ἐναντιὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐυμμάχων* (Thuc. II, 13, 3) does not mean that generally speaking 600 talents of tribute were received each year from the allies, but rather that 600 talents a year were received from the allies, in most part from the tribute.

The reviewer has read this book with great interest. It makes good use of the literary source material, and offers many excellent suggestions in the restoration and interpretation of the inscriptions. But there is much that is open to serious misgiving, especially in the interpretation of the quota lists from 436 to 427. It has been impossible here to go into all details. The volume may be read with great profit, but should also be read with discretion.

BENJAMIN D. MERITT.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua. Volume IV. Monuments and Documents from Eastern Asia and Western Galatia. Edited by W. H. BUCKLER, W. M. CALDER, W. K. C. GUTHRIE. Publications of the American Society for archaeological research in Asia Minor. Manchester University Press, 1933. Pp. xix + 144, 71 plates. 40s. net.

The value of this series is well known; it has for years provided us with careful editions of texts, published and unpublished, each equipped with a facsimile which obviates many uncertainties in the future. As in previous volumes, the comments have been kept brief, but they are masterly, and as before we have an excellent introduction which appraises the material thus presented. W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder need no introduction; W. K. C. Guthrie is very promising and welcome as a new worker in this field.

The evidence now laid before us comes from a small compact area, in which Synnada, Apollonia, and Dionysopolis bulk largest. It is a great advantage to be able to use what is a provisional corpus for this region. The inscriptions show us an overwhelming predominance of native religion, clothed in Greek terms; Zeus and Apollo, with the local epithets which veil old gods of the land, Artemis and Leto and Helios are the chief figures. There is no word of Isis, Sarapis, Mithras, Attis, Cybele, Juppiter Dolichenus; two dedications at most to Dionysus, one to Men, and one mention of Asclepius. We do not know to what cult οἱ μύσται refers at Apollonia (167); probably either to some local institution or to Dionysus. In 281, one of the new "confession inscriptions," we read *κολασθεῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πολλάκις καὶ πολλοῖς χρόνοις διὰ τὸ μ(ῆ) βούλεσθε αὐτὸν ποσελθεῖν καὶ παρεστάναι τῷ μυστηρίῳ καλούμενον ἐν*, where it is tempting to suppose that the lost continuation was something like *ὀνείροις*, referring to the dreams in which divine commands were here so often thought to be given. This mysterion was probably of the native type such as we find in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Syria, in which there was no element of initiation but only a drama at which the faithful assisted. We cannot postulate anything like the familiar mystery-religions of the Graeco-Roman world at large. In this region religion had very little in common with the general trends of that world; the population had only two things in common with the men of Alexandria and Corinth and Pergamon—divine names, and the cult-honors paid to the Emperor. Clearly distinct as these last were from normal worship paid to the gods [e. g., no. 292, dedication to Augustus, in his lifetime, by a priest *τειμῆς ἔνεκεν εἰς τε τὸν αὐτοκράτορα καὶ τὸν*

οἶκον], they had a special importance in that they were thus universal.

Asia Minor is a geographical entity, and we are often tempted to think of it as a cultural and religious entity in ancient times. Yet it embraced a range of variety almost as great as that of Europe to-day, covering the highly hellenized coastline on the west and such diverse regions as this area, Galatia, Pontus, with their Celtic, Iranian and Hittite strains. This region received Greek influences, and in particular Seleucid influences (75, 226), but retained its individuality.

To come to detail, we may note in particular no. 82A, a sarcophagus of considerable interest; no. 88, a panel (? from a sarcophagus) with the formula ζῶν κτῶ χρῶ; no. 90, an archisynagogos; no. 110, the trisagion on a capital (cf. H. I. Bell, *Studies F. Ll. Griffith*, 202); no. 143, the Apollonia fragments of the Res Gestae of Augustus (with 66 lines not previously known in this copy); no. 230, Μηνὶ Πλουρυστρέων, a clear instance of the genitive with the name of worshippers discussed by me, *J. H. S.*, XLVIII, 42; the plan of the hieron of Apollo Lermenos near Ortakou, p. 98; nos. 279-290, new confession texts from the hieron, some of peculiar value (e. g., 282, in which Amazons and the Nikomachides figure after Apollo as deities); no. 330, a fragment of the Edict of Diocletian fixing prices; and various early Christian inscriptions.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

JOHANNES SYKUTRIS. Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker. *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, XVIII Band, 2 Heft. Paderborn, 1933. Pp. 125.

This monograph presents the arguments the conclusions of which are printed in the author's article, "Sokratikerbriefe," in Pauly-Wissowa R. E. Supplement V 981-987. It will serve also as a companion work to the critical edition of these letters which Dr. Sykutris promises to publish.

The chief conclusion of the work is that the letters of Socrates (1-7) and the Socratics (8-35), with the exception of 28 and 35, form two unified groups each by a single author. It is difficult to assume that the stiff and silly letters which comprise the rest of the collection are by the author of 8-13, which are not without a measure of humor in their attack on Antisthenes and Simon. It is clear that 8 and 12 were written only to give occasion for the composition of the ironical answers of Aristippus and that 10 exists not merely to show how nobly Aristippus used his friendship with Dionysius but to demonstrate by 11 that Aris-

tippus was too scornful of Antisthenes to defend himself seriously in his letter to him. In short, 10-11 is not merely a foil to the other four but an indication of the way in which they are to be interpreted. This is inconsistent with the "konziliatorisches Bestreben" of the rest of the collection and is not due to the author's inability to conjure away or hide the enmity of Antisthenes and Aristippus, for the sole purpose of this little group is to ridicule Antisthenes and Simon.

Dittmar's use of 6 to reconstruct the *Kallias* of Aeschines and Dümmler's theory that the *Archelaus* of Antisthenes is the ultimate source of 1 are satisfactorily refuted. Since the Diogenes letter 32 is recognized as one of the patterns of 8 it is unnecessary to suppose [Plato] Epistle 7 to be the source of the proverbial *Σικελιωτικαὶ τράπεζαι*; and I cannot believe that an imitator would have "weakened" τοὺς ἐξ ἀπάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης of [Plato] Epistle 4, 320 D to the πάντας of 29 § 1. In 6 § 6 I should suggest the reading παιδεῦσαι for παιδεύσεως with a comma after ἔργοις.

There is an emended text and an interpretation of 35 which succeeds in making something of the letter, which Dr. Sykutris separates from the rest of the collection as a forged Pythagorean writing later than the second century A. D.

HAROLD CHERNISS.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

ALOIS WALDE. Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Dritte neu bearbeitete Auflage, von J. B. Hoffmann. 7. Lieferung. Heidelberg, Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1934. Pp. 481-560.

The fifth and sixth fascicles of this important work appeared in 1932, and were reviewed in this JOURNAL, LIV, 297-299. The present fascicle covers ferentārius to fullō, which in the second edition ran from page 283 to page 324; eighty pages of the third edition, to forty-one of the second. This increase is due largely to the growth of the articles, not to new inserted articles; for the third edition has only 183 captions to 177 of the second (cross-references are included in both figures). The new articles, other than cross-references, are Feretrius, ferrūmen, [festō], fifeltārēs, fimārium, fladō, flaxtabulae, frāgus, fraxāre, [fuat]; the omissions are a few cross-references, and the article frūmo (verb invented by Isidorus to explain frumentum).

The material is often recast in the new edition. Thus fistūca, forfex, foveō, frivolus, frūstrā, which had articles in the second edition, are now reduced to cross-references; for and forum are promoted from cross-references to articles. The caption words

are often changed in one respect or another: *ferreola* (for *fereola* of 2nd ed.), *fervō* (for *ferveo*), *ficēdula* (*fīcedula*), *flūta* (*fluta*), *fōcilō* (*focilo*), *for* (*fōr*), *forda* (for *fordus* of the 2nd ed.; an adjective meaning 'pregnant' could not have a masculine form); *fracēs* (noun, replacing verb *fraceo* as caption), *fragor* (for *frāgor*), *fragrō* (*frāgro*), *frōns* (*frons*, both words), *frūnīscor* (*frūniscor*), *frūstrā* (*frustra*), *frustum* (*frūstum*). These are in addition to the regular placing of the macron over the final *o* of the first singular of verbs and of nominatives of nouns (e. g., *fiṅgō*, *fictiō*), which in the second edition were left unmarked.

A few further comments. On *Feretrius*, cf. now G. S. Hopkins, *Indo-European *deiwo*s and Related Words, 32-36 (Lang. Diss. 12 of the Ling. Soc. of America). The caption *Fidius* of the 2nd ed. is replaced by the double caption *fidēs*, *Fidius*. On *firmus*, to which Hofmann gives in parenthesis the comment "*-ī* Inschr., Sommer Hb.² 121", it may be said that the evidence of Italian *fermo* in favor of *ī* outweighs the single inscriptional tall *i* (*C. I. L.*, VI, 1248). On page 534, the caption *formus* is a misprint for *fornus*. On *frāgum* 'strawberry', see now H. H. Bender in this JOURNAL, LV, 71-73, who demonstrates the correctness of Skeat's connection of strawberry with straw, and thus completes the separation of the English word from the Latin *frāgum*. *Frūmen*, which was one caption in the 2nd ed., is now divided into two. On page 555, *fuam* is between *frūx* and *fū*, and on 557 [*fuat*] stands between *fugiō* and *fuī*; both are slightly out of alphabetical position.

We look forward with eagerness to the later fascicles of this invaluable work.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Bibliotheca Philologica Classica. Band 59 (1932). Bearbeitet von Wilhelm Rehnitz. Leipzig, *O. R. Reisland*, 1934. 8°. (Beiblatt zum Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. Jahrg. 58. 1932.)

Bottiglioni (Gino). *L'Ermeneutica Etrusca*. Discorso per la solenne inaugurazione dell' anno accademico 1933-34. (Estratto dall' Annuario della R. Università di Pavia per l'Anno Accademico 1933-34). Pavia, *Tipographia già Cooperativa*, 1934. Pp. 33.

Brink (Karl Oskar). *Stil und Form der Pseudoaristotelischen Magna Moralia*. Ohlau in Schlesien, *Dr. Hermann Eschenhagen KG.*, 1933. Pp. vi + 111. 8°.

British Museum. *The Mount Sinai Manuscript of the Bible*. Second Edition. Oxford, *University Press*, 1934. Pp. 22, with four illustrations.

Burck (Erich). *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius*. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1934. Pp. 244. RM. 16. (Problemata, Heft 11.)

Fargues (Pierre). *Claudien. Études sur sa Poésie et son Temps*. Paris, *Librairie Hachette*, 1933. Pp. 345.

Haffter (Heinz). *Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache*. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1934. Pp. 153. RM. 10. (Problemata, Heft 10.)

Journal (The) of Education. March 1, 1934. Pp. 129-176. April 2, 1934. Pp. 193-240. London, *William Rice*. 4°.

Kok (W.). *Tertullianus: De Cultu Feminarum*. Met Inleiding, Vertaling, en Commentaar. Dokkum, *Firma J. Kamminga*, 1934. Pp. 212. 8°.

Long (Wesley Robertson). *La Flor de las Ystorias de Orient*, by Hayton, Prince of Gorigos. Edited from the unique MS. Escorial Z-I-2 with introduction, bibliography, and notes. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1934. Pp. 223. Frontispiece. \$2.00.

Nutting (Herbert C.) *Comments on Lucan*. Eighth Series. Berkeley, *University of California Press*, 1934. 8°. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. II, No. 12, pp. 305-318.)

Philological Quarterly. Vol. XIII, No. 1. *The University of Iowa*, Iowa City, Iowa, 1934. Pp. 1-96.

Sewanee Review. Vol. XLII, 2. April-June, 1934. Sewanee, Tennessee, *The University of the South*. Pp. 129-256. 8°.

Tracy (Sterling). *Philo Judaeus and the Roman Principate*. Williamsport, Pennsylvania, *The Bayard Press*, 1933. Pp. 55.

Yon (Albert). *Ratio et les Mots de la Famille de Reor*. Contribution à l'étude Historique du Vocabulaire Latin. Paris, *Édouard Champion*, 1933. Pp. xvi + 291. 8°. (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris. XXXVI.)